

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW

QUARTERLY

Vol. XII

OCTOBER, 1927

No. 4

EDITORIAL

THE PRINCIPLE THAT ONE EXTREME PROVOKES THE other seems to find an example in certain developments in the Church of England. We have heard so much in America about the Anglo-Catholic movement and the party representing it, that our attention has been fastened chiefly on questions attending the Rome-ward trend in that great communion. But along with that movement another, of a decidedly opposite character, has been gathering force, though it has received little or no attention in this country. This is the Liberal Evangelical Movement within the Established Church.

In this case the term "liberal" is found to be quite consistently coupled with "evangelical" when it is understood that it refers to ecclesiastical rather than theological liberalism.

Dr. Sweet, one of our associate editors, recently spent some months in Great Britain, where he devoted considerable time to the study of this promising spiritual development, and he discusses it from the view point of a sympathetic American theologian in his article, *The Liberal Evangelical Movement in the Church of England*. This movement had produced a really remarkable literature, including two notable volumes of

essays, and Dr. Sweet devotes considerable space to these, since they are representative of his subject.

He also considers three points almost certain to be in the mind of the American reader—the Church, the Sacraments, and the Ministry. Whatever the details involved, however, the very fact that the spiritual life and the spiritual hunger of men within the Established Church have crystallized in such organized and aggressive form is a reason for hope in the immediate future of the whole Christian body.

ONE OF THE MARKS OF GOOD LITERARY TASTE APPEARS in the choice of synonyms. The use of exactly the right word for the thing in mind gives a fine flavor to one's language—an engaging quality that is missing where the thought is fairly indicated rather than vividly expressed.

One of the advantages of reading the New Testament in the Greek is that the student thereby often recovers some revealing shade of meaning, if not some essential idea, that has been obscured, or even lost, in our common versions. The difficulty frequently lies in our own language, which fails to supply in every case a term to register faithfully the content of the original. The field of exegesis therefore has rich rewards for the preacher who will cultivate it with care.

In the paper by Dr. Vos, "True" and "Truth" in the Johannine Writings, we have an instance. Who ordinarily notes in his reading of John that the cognate terms, "true" and "truth," "possess inherently two distinct connotations"? Yet here we are shown that such a distinction exists, what it is, and its significance in John's great portrait of our Lord. The author makes use of the words *veracious* and *veritable* to help mark

the distinction between the two meanings of "true," which in the Greek were conveyed by two similar yet distinct terms.

But the reader gains more than a nice distinction of terms. Dr. Vos helps us to distinguish one of those spiritual overtones that charm the ear that is attuned to the loftier harmonies.

WHO HAS NOT ENJOYED MANY LAUGHABLE EXAMPLES of statements that are utterly ludicrous, not because of their wording, but through the omission or misplacing of commas? What if we had none? But those who translated the Scriptures from the old manuscripts had to face the problem offered by the lack of any adequate system of punctuation.

Might it not be possible, then, to discover even today some rather serious mistranslation due to the absence of marks to indicate the proper termination of a sentence or clause? Mr. Mauro submits strong evidence to sustain his belief that we have such a case in 2 Timothy 2:19. Certainly, as this passage stands in either of our regular English versions, it has rather little force.

The study centers about the meaning of "foundation" and of "seal." The former is shown to refer to Christ Himself, and, stressing the significance of the latter, Mr. Mauro shows that it can hardly refer to the two statements immediately following it in the text, as has been commonly held. What then is this "seal"? He points out that a period should follow that word in our versions. If one begins with verse 16 and reads until he ends with the word "seal," as though it had a full stop after it, he will hardly need Mr. Mauro's care-

fully worked out argument to convince him that "seal" refers to the Resurrection.

THE ARTICLES UPON RELIGIOUS AFFAIRS IN THE EARLY Christian centuries, which Dr. Sihler has contributed to these pages, have been historical rather than biographical. They have analyzed chiefly the contacts of Christianity with the religions it encountered as it began to spread and entrench itself in the world. Where individuals have represented their times or groups they have indeed been prominent, but rather as symbolizing the period, race, or religion that claimed them. That is, these have not been primarily studies of individual lives.

In the present instance we have something more nearly of the biographical order. In St. Paul and Seneca, the great Apostle of Jesus Christ and the renowned Roman moralist are compared. Considerable space is devoted to the circumstances of Seneca's life. Perhaps many have conceived of this man, listed among the philosophers, as one who had little to do with the ambitions and struggles of the world about him. To such this paper will be a revelation. They will perceive the exceeding worldliness of this wealthy moralist who is credited with the words, "Not he who has little, but he who wishes for more is poor."

Perhaps no better way can be found to contrast the insufficiency of ethics as over against a vital religion that changes the very desires of the heart than by confronting a Seneca with a Paul, as is done here, in one of the best of the studies which Dr. Sihler has given us.

THE GOSPEL IS ITS OWN ULTIMATE DEFENSE. WELL authenticated records of a miracle working Teacher from

Nazareth, and His amazing claims, might escape denial; but if historical accuracy were their one reliance, the more deadly peril of indifference would bury them in obscurity at last. Those writings survive because they do infinitely more than meet the demands of the few minds that delight in research; they endure because they radiate that light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.

Christian "evidences" and "apologetics" are really of secondary importance; the convincing power of the Christian message lies in the glowing vitality of its very essence, to which the spiritual intuitions respond. Men sense its divine truth with their souls, when their minds can prove nothing. Historical proofs are helpful, but not indispensable, to the heart that is moved to stake all upon the integrity of those Scriptures wherein he already recognizes the handwriting of God.

So Christianity would sweep on if, for example, The Apology of Aristides, of which Parke P. Flournoy writes, had never been found, or even written. Yet such writings reveal much that we are pleased to know about the early history of the faith and the world's first reactions to it. In this interesting paper we have a sketch of the recovery of this lost Christian document, of the occasion for its existence, of the way it was preserved, and some of its characteristics, as well as evidences of the influence of the Pauline writings upon it. There is also something about the Apology of Quadratus, a contemporary of Aristides.

As this apology is frequently referred to in a somewhat vague way, this more explicit account will be very acceptable to readers who desire full and exact information on a subject of considerable historical interest and value.

THE BOOK REVIEWS IN THIS ISSUE COVER SEVERAL VOLUMES of particular value. The reviewers have all plainly made the volumes they deal with objects of painstaking study, and their criticisms are correspondingly worthy of careful attention. The titles covered this time are:

Life, Character and Influence of Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam.—Mangan.

The Nature of Religion.—Paterson.

Psychologies of 1925.—Murchison.

Fear: The Autobiography of James Edwards.—Oliver.

John Wyclif.—Workman.

The Parables: Their Background and Local Setting.—Levison.

R. M. K.

THE LIBERAL EVANGELICAL MOVEMENT IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

By LOUIS MATTHEWS SWEET

NO ONE, not himself an Anglican of the trans-Atlantic type, is likely adequately to realize the comprehensiveness of the Church of England. We are familiar, of course, in a general way with the distinctive types of churchmanship designated by the terms "High," "Low," and "Broad." Most of us, however, have little conception of the individual varieties of thought and action on the part of churches and clergy which are allowable within the generous limits of an establishment that to the outsider appears rather inelastic and unadaptable.

As a friend of the writer, himself a clergyman and a loyal churchman, used to put it, "The clergy of the Church of England run all the way from one so close to Rome that if he knocked on the door it would wake the Pope, to one at the other extreme, practically indistinguishable from a Methodist exhorter." Two such extremes met once to my knowledge. One Anglican said to another, "Will you say Mass in my church on Sunday?" The reply was, "Nothing of that sort, but I will preach the Gospel any time you like." Between these two extreme types there are all kinds of intermediate phases, but in the final analysis, summing up general tendencies, there are two main divisions, described respectively by the terms "Catholic" and "Evangelical."

We are concerned here with "Liberal Evangelicalism," which its leaders prefer to call a movement seeking to win men to its principles, rather than a party

trying to get results by ecclesiastical action. The new Evangelical group is at the present time by no means a submerged or silent one. It has come to definite utterance in numerous pamphlets, and of late in two sizeable volumes, both well co-ordinated symposia, the first entitled *Liberal Evangelicalism*, and the second, *The Inner Life, Essays in Liberal Evangelicalism*. The former was published in 1923 and the latter two or three years later. It is to be regretted that the publishers have, in the case of the more recent volume, yielded to the current practice of issuing a book bearing no discoverable date. A study of the movement really involves a careful review of these various publications, emphasizing more particularly the two important volumes just mentioned.

With no further preliminary remarks, except to say with emphasis that the writer proposes an interpretation of the movement and not a criticism of it, which is quite unnecessary as the reader may be presumed to be quite capable of doing his own criticizing, we shall turn at once to the review.

The Introduction to each volume of essays was written by Rev. T. Guy Rogers of Birmingham, and in the Introduction to the second, entitled *The Inner Life*, there is a passage so important that in spite of its length I shall take the liberty of presenting it in its entirety. It gives a comprehensive view of the purpose of the writers and the method of their procedure:

The title of this book implies a history. Volume I of *Liberal Evangelicalism* appeared in February, 1923, and has already nearly exhausted its fourth edition. It represented an intellectual and spiritual movement of the Evangelical School of thought within the Church of England. A group of men, brought up in the Evangelical tradition and rejoicing in its interpretation of the Gospel, endeavoured to formulate the evangelical message anew for the age in which they lived. It was

necessary for them to speak courageously as well as reverently, and to explore such questions as the Person of Christ, the Authority of Scripture and of the Church, the Meaning of the Kingdom and the Rule of Life. It was inevitable that they should come into collision with some Anglo-Catholics whose view of the nature of God is different from their own, and with some of their Evangelical brethren who still believe in the inerrancy of every part of the Scriptures. The ground had to be cleared if Evangelicalism was to become once more a great spiritual movement untrammelled by fetters never laid on it by Christ. The movement which created the earlier book is steadily growing. More than 600 clergy belong to the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement. Their aim is to apply Gospel principles to personal religion, social questions and the problems of institutional Church life, and their policy endorses such efforts at Re-statement as have been made. Fifty-three pamphlets dealing with the Christian faith in relation to Theology, Sociology and Science have been published for the Movement by Hodder & Stoughton under the Editorship of Canon Vernon Storr and the Rev. G. H. Harris.

This second volume directs itself more particularly to the Inner Life. It seeks to show how God works through the evolutionary process which the history of the world reveals, how He enters into and co-operates with the spirit of Man, and brings him into fellowship with Himself. The origin and meaning of sin is discussed and an answer given to the question so often asked: "What do you really mean by the Grace of God?" We have been at some pains to deal with conversion in relation to modern psychology and to explain what the doctrine of the Indwelling Christ means in our own spiritual experience. We have traced the outward expression of this inner life in witness and service, and in the domain of Christian values. Finally, we have dealt with the aids afforded to the Inner Life by Prayer, Bible reading, corporate life within the Church and the Sacrament of the Holy Communion. [II, p. v, f.]

Coupling this statement with the Introduction to the first volume, in which Mr. Rogers emphasizes the fact, also true of the second series, that the volume is not a collection of miscellaneous essays but a work of collaboration in the course of which "the view broadly presented and the general method of treatment have

been submitted to the 'common mind,' " it becomes evident that we shall be set free from the necessity of correlating casual utterances and shall be enabled to grasp in a very unusual way the working of what amounts to a corporate mind.

At the outset it is necessary that we should have an accurate estimate of the weight and standing of the group. It is at once evident that it is strikingly representative. The fourteen papers of the first volume were written by twelve men, of whom six reappear among the twelve who are responsible for the fourteen essays of volume II. These eighteen are without exception men of academic and ecclesiastical distinction, several of them in more than one field of activity. It would be tiresome and unprofitable to enumerate the various degrees held by these leaders or to list the positions of influence and authority filled by them, but a partial summary will be interesting and valuable.

In the group are three bishops, four deans, nine canons, five fellows or fellows and tutors of various colleges, eight principals or vice-principals of institutions of higher education, one fellow of the Royal Society, and so on. There* really must be something legendary in the twin stories so often repeated, that the Evangelical group is obscure and without influence, and that evangelicals cannot expect preferment in the Church of England. Mr. Rogers states that the enrolment now numbers six hundred, but the tables of Contents in the two volumes give a more impressive view of the weight and importance of the leaders in this historic movement. Among the rank and file of the group there are, of course, many who are just everyday parish clergymen. We have been speaking of the intellectual leaders.

The first fact which emerges from a study of these introductory statements is, that the movement is a carrying-on, under new conditions and toward, at least, hope for fresh achievements, of an old and established type of thought and life in The Church of England. Mr. Rogers says:

The title of Liberal Evangelical is probably no more and no less satisfactory than other titles which designate groups within the Church of England. It appeals to the writers, however, for two reasons. It suggests that the "heredity" of their movement is rooted in the great Evangelical Revival, and that the "environment" in which they are at home is the modern world with its historical method, its philosophy of personality, and its scientific view of the universe. [I, p. v.]

It is probably true, as I see it, that this title could not readily be adopted for a like-minded group in the United States for the reason that popular usage and controversial habit have separated the two words contained in it and made them separately the badges of party. If a man is a "Liberal," in the connotation of American controversy, he cannot well be an evangelical, and *vice versa*. Not only is this true, but in the principles of interpretation which they have adopted they have attempted to weld together seeming incompatibles, or at least principles which among ourselves have been driven widely assunder. The American reader is therefore urged to consider the fact that the Liberal Evangelical is just as tenacious of the adjective in his title as of the noun and just as devoted to his noun as to his adjective. Mr. Rogers says:

The Evangelical Revival, with its renewed emphasis on the soul's direct relationship to God, on the freedom of the Spirit, the authority of the Bible, the centrality of the Cross, and the need of Conversion, has been a dynamic force within the Church of England. It has not only profoundly affected individual souls, but has gradually created a feeling and an emphasis with

regard to Tradition, Church Order, the Ministry, Sacraments, Reunion, and the Rule of Life which are of the first importance. [I, p. v, f.]

That is the evangelicalism of the movement.

Restatement, however, has become essential. If the Evangelical message is still to be operative in a world so changed from that of the eighteenth century, it must show that it can outgrow the "scholasticism" of that century and manifest itself anew in terms of life. It must be made clear that the emphasis spoken of is not tied to a particular point, but can shift freely along the line of the Spirit's guidance from age to age. [I, p. vi.]

That is the liberalism of the movement.

Mr. Rogers cites two examples of restatement dealt with in the first volume. First, under The Authority of the Bible:

This still stands in its unique position. The right of appeal to the historical records in order to check the growth of traditional accretion, to correct errors of Church teaching, and to release continually new spiritual movements within the Church, remains as much a part of the creed of the Evangelical as ever. But the authority of the Bible is seen to centre in its relation to the revelation of God in Christ. It is the mind of Christ, not the letter of Holy Scripture, which is authoritative. [I, p. vi.]

There is something in this statement from which an American Conservative may wish to dissent, but it should be noted that the authority of the Bible, while defined in a new and rather more limited way, is yet accepted cordially and frankly and not thrown overboard.

Second, under The Atonement:

The modern Evangelical finds salvation for himself and for society at the Cross of Jesus. This is as central to his religious experience as it was to St. Paul. He can not only say, but he cannot help saying, "The Son of God Who loved me and gave Himself for me." There is no other Gospel for him but that of

God's Love in action supremely manifested in the Cross. There, as in the story of Bunyan's Pilgrim, he finds peace, forgiveness, and a new sense of filial relationship to God. His hope for the world lies in the redemptive forces which contact with that Love releases in human personality. But the doctrine is no longer related in his mind to a primeval Fall of Man, nor need it find expression in forensic terms. The modern Evangelical is dissatisfied with some of the older and cruder penal and substitutionary theories of the Atonement. It is the impact of the Cross upon personality which he seeks to explore. He tries to make it live for men and women of to-day as the great preachers of the Gospel in other generations made it live for the people of their own day. He is conscious that his own presentation of theological truth will in due time pass like theirs, and that his own sincere effort to interpret the redeeming Love of God in Christ will be replaced, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, by new efforts in relation to new modes of thought. [I, p. vi, f.]

These quotations will serve to make clear to the reader the basis upon which rests the statement made a few lines back, that the Liberal Evangelical brings new emphasis and new interpretations into conjunction with a fervid and whole-souled preaching and teaching of the historic Gospel. In his own opinion, at least, the liberalism of his attitude toward modern ways of thinking does not compromise his loyalty to the Gospel of the Lord Jesus.

This same attitude of staunch loyalty to the historic faith, together with a deep sense of duty to proclaim it, is admirably expressed by the author of the first essay of volume I, Dr. H. A. Wilson of Cheltenham:

It is our firm conviction that there are permanent elements in our view of truth which are not only essential, if the City of God is to lie four-square, but that the core of Evangelicalism is indestructible. The past generations from which we draw our spiritual life may have erred. . . . But the work they did for England and England's faith was greater than their own generation ever knew. The supreme victory is proven by the fact that Evangelicalism is a wider thing to-day than the

Evangelicals. We, their children, glory in this, that the central truths which God called our fathers to re-discover and re-vitalise are no peculiar possessions of our own.

Yet we do not believe that our task is done. As a group within the Church, we exist as a body of men who regard ourselves as called of God to see that the torch is kept burning brightly, and that we hand it on faithfully to those who will faithfully fulfil the trust. The fashion of our countenance may differ from those who have preceded us, but we are assured that our heart is right with their heart, and that our Evangel is in all essential truth the same as theirs. [I, p. 27.]

So far, we have considered the attitude of the Liberal Evangelical Group toward that body of truth which is in a general way the common possession of all those who bear the evangelical name. We have now to define a little more precisely their attitude toward points of ancient and modern controversy. We may safely begin with the vexed question of authority. As a fact, nearly every essay, in the first volume at least, begins or ends with the question of authority. But we shall all be benefited by a careful reading of the essay in the first volume by T. Guy Rogers. And it will be well for us to remember that much of this historic controversy centers about what may be termed secondary authority. I wonder if any mature reader of these pages can remember a controversy in which along with the Bible the "standards" of "the church," that is, of the particular branch of the church involved, do not also figure? The Liberal Evangelical seems to have no doubt or serious questioning about his primary authority:

The Bible as the record of a progressive revelation of God made fully manifest in His Son, as enabling us to see the Life in relation to human history and experience, is entitled to the position of a final court of appeal which has been assigned to it by a sturdy Protestantism [I, p. 41].

Whatever qualifications may accompany this statement, its general significance is unmistakable. The Bible is a real and permanent standard of authority. Now, note carefully what follows:

It is when we come to consider the possibility of a second fixed point such as Overton ascribes to the Articles that serious difficulty arises. Viewed in relation to their own day, the Articles may be regarded as a charter of freedom; in relation to ours, they may present the appearance of a fetter to progress. This doctrine of relativity is of the utmost importance. No Evangelical is likely to under-value the Articles as a whole. [I, p. 41.]

Here follows a fine statement of the value of the Articles interpreted in the historical sense, in which occurs this statement:

There is so much to be grateful for in this work of the English Reformers, that it is a pity to take the edge off our gratitude by submitting it to too severe a strain. The Articles are not infallible. [I, p. 42.]

In defining his principle of authority Rogers quotes and endorses with enthusiasm the words of Principal Forsyth in his book, *The Principle of Authority*: "The Word is not the book nor its facts, but its one Divine Fact; its historic Gospel of the Grace of a holy God to human guilt effecting man's forgiven regeneration in a final way through our faith in the Cross and Person of Jesus Christ, the Eternal Son of God. This was the Fact whose belief created the Church." To these words Rogers adds, "All else is relative but with very varying degrees in the authority exerted."

In the essay on *Evangelicalism and Personality*, by the Dean of Bristol, the following remark on Anglo-Catholicism in relationship to unity is of interest:

In spite of the great vogue, in the restricted areas, of Anglo-Catholicism to-day, there is nothing to suggest that an Anglo-Catholic Church of England would have any chance of

uniting the English people, let alone the Scots. At best it might stand as the most ardent, united, and respectable of the Sects, and so prolong the age of sectarianism. [I, p. 56.]

On the other hand the Dean asserts that "Past and present history alike suggest that a Christianity which is really to win into one Church the British peoples must be sought, if anywhere, on something like Evangelical ground" (I, p. 56). It becomes increasingly evident as one reads these essays, that the leaders of the movement are evidently bent on bringing about a *rapprochement* between historic evangelicalism and the movements stirring throughout the world in the direction of greater freedom of individual judgment, or, in other terms, to achieve a "synthesis between vital Christianity and the characteristic forms of modern thought." They are attempting to interpret "a religion which stands for the inclusiveness of Love as well as for the definiteness of Truth."

The remainder of this paper must be given to the consideration of certain points which are crucial for those who are studying this movement from a position outside the Anglican Communion. These points may be summed up as, the Church, the Sacraments, and the Ministry. The entire seventh paper of the first volume is devoted to these subjects, with many incidental references elsewhere. According to the author of this paper, Rev. H. B. Gooding, Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, there were three stages in the process which culminated in the establishment of the Christian church, the history of which "begins with its Founder, Jesus Christ":

1. The "gradual apprehension of God among the Hebrews which led to what is called Ethical Monotheism" (I, p. 148).

2. The Incarnation, through which "The meaning of the previous process of development becomes clearer," and "The nation is given a fuller apprehension of the Nature of God as revealed in Christ than had previously been attained." (I, p. 148.)

3. Pentecost, when "the Divine Life, the Spirit of God, actually passed in a supreme degree into those who, because all the conditions of knowledge, of forgiveness, of faith, had been fulfilled, were now capable of receiving that Life and entering into complete fellowship with God and with one another" (I, p. 149).

The significance of this outline is that it emphasizes at once the uniqueness of Pentecost as the culminating stage in making the church a "fact" and its continuity with the long preparatory processes which had gone before and prepared the way for this culmination.

In contrast with the three stages in the building of the church the author alleges three limitations to the fulfilment of the idea embodied in its establishment:

I. The imperfect realization that the church must be universal. All peoples must be brought within it.
 II. The idea of perfect fellowship which rests upon the realization of the Divine Life within its individual members has been so imperfectly realized that the church that "ought to be" is still so far in the future.
 III. "Various parts of the existing Body, so far from endeavouring to realise that common fellowship which constitutes the reality of the Church, are contented to seek their own ends" . . . (I, p. 152 f.).

These limitations—lack of expansive power, lack of individual Christian living, lack of unity—can only be overcome when they are definitely attacked through co-operation "in those very directions in which limitations now exist."

The discussion of the Sacraments turns largely upon a single general postulate: "The use of sacraments is a natural element in the spiritual Life." This principle to be sure does not carry us very far since it is quite compatible with any theory of the sacraments, but the following statements are more sharply definitive. The sacraments have a twofold meaning. First, they are the natural and necessary expression in a material environment of a spiritual fact *which already exists* and is not created by the sacramental act itself. This statement, as everyone familiar with the discussion will at once perceive, keeps the sacraments within the limits of the essential evangelical definition. The second definition of meaning put forward is that the sacraments foster the maintenance and development of the spiritual experience or state out of which they arose. This view of the sacraments involves the fundamental Protestant position, that there is no mechanical efficacy in the sacraments as such, but that repentance, faith, and spiritual communion are necessary. Additional force is added to the general argument by the consideration that, since the sacraments are social acts, they deepen and intensify the common life of believers who really thus commune with one another as well as with God.

The question of the ministry is, of course, essential and crucial, particularly in view of the intense interest in church reunion which is one of the strong motivating influences of the whole movement. In general it may be said that for an Anglican of whatever school the only regular ministry, from the point of view of order, is the threefold ministry which involves the apostolic succession through Episcopal ordination. One can hardly find fault with an Anglican for holding this view inasmuch as it is the *raison d'être* for the separate existence

of his church. The only question which arises in immediate connection with church union is, whether the logic of his position compels the Anglican to deny the validity of a type of ministry which he must necessarily look upon as historically irregular. In the case of the Liberal Evangelical there is no ambiguity whatever. Our author rejects with emphasis the idea that no ministry is valid except that which has apostolic succession (I, p. 169). In view of this general position the course and tenor of the argument for the threefold ministry is intensely interesting.

It starts out with an explicit acceptance of the principle known as the "priesthood of all believers," which inevitably raises the question (for others than Anglicans, be it remembered) as to the propriety of any ordained ministry at all. The Dean's answer is very sensible and convincing, albeit not characteristically churchly. The ministry arose under the sanction of our Lord, as a natural outcome of the division of labor in a growing body of believers and workers.

The threefold ministry was a product of the church organization. In the New Testament, while the sharply drawn distinction of later days between grades of the clergy do not appear, a broad distinction clearly appears between ministers whose function is itinerant and universal and those whose work is local and restricted. While the threefold ministry developed gradually, as the outcome of a historical process, it yet grew up under the sanction of the apostles. The minister represents the whole body of believers, and holds his authority not by direct commission to him alone, but mediately through the body which he represents. The threefold ministry is amply justified as the outcome of a process which took place under the guidance of the Holy Spirit,

is abundantly justified by reference to historical precedent, and helps to maintain historical continuity. It does not, however, in turn justify the invalidation of other modes of organization. The church is alive, and the details of organization are to be interpreted as expressions of that life.

I should like to include in this survey of this movement a detailed study of its contributions to the philosophy of various elements of the spiritual life, did not space forbid. Almost the entire second volume, which is devoted to the exposition of the inner and more devotional aspects of the church, must be passed on in silence. I must say a few words on the relationship of the new movement to church union, or, as they prefer to state it, Church reunion. All Anglicans of whatever stripe are intensely desirous of healing what they call the wounds of Christendom. Some of them are looking with intense longing for reunion with the Roman and Greek communions, while others, notably the Evangelical group with which we have been dealing in these pages, are particularly concerned with the large Non-conformist groups in England and elsewhere.

One of the pamphlets of the Liberal Evangelical propaganda, entitled, *Getting Ready for Reunion*, is in reality the reprint of a sermon by Canon E. S. Woods, late of Holy Trinity, Cambridge, now of Croyden by appointment of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Introduction to the sermon is very moving, "The substance of this pamphlet was a sermon preached in St. Giles' Cathedral, Edinburgh, on June 20th of this year; and it has seemed best to let the sermon form remain, if only as a humble tribute to the Minister and the people of St. Giles, who provided an 'atmosphere' such as calls forth a preacher's best and who indeed first sug-

gested that what was said in their Church that day might be recorded in print." The Introduction also states that the pastor of St. Giles, Rev. Charles Warr, had preached in Holy Trinity, Cambridge. In closing this paper, I shall quote several sentences from this sermon, both for their substance and for their spirit, truly representing, as I believe, the temper and purpose of this honest and earnest body of Christian men:

"This attitude of mind about Reunion (namely, looking upon it as an imperative necessity which must be attained) which I have been indicating, will, among other things, involve penitence; a really deep shame and genuine contrition that we in the Churches have stayed so far away from the mind of Christ. In God's sight it is probably quite as wrong for Christians to treat other Christians with suspicion or hostility or ignorant indifference as it is to lie, and to lust and to slay. It will also involve thanksgiving; thanksgiving for the great and rich variety within the family fellowship of Christ. My notion of Reunion does not in the least mean a heavy flattening out of our differences into one thin and dreary level. Strong life means always rich variety; and those who in religious things seek after a rigid uniformity (and there are plenty of groups in the Church, whose only idea of Reunion is that all the rest should become like themselves)—those who think like this seem to me to be curiously blind to God's ways in nature and with men. As the Lambeth Conference urged: 'It is not by reducing the different groups of Christians to uniformity, but by rightly using their diversity, that the Church can become all things to all men. So long as there is vital connexion with the Head, there is positive value in the differentiation of the members.' Why should not Christians and Churches learn, as a normal

and ordinary Christian duty, to give thanks to God for the glorious variety of thought and experience within the great Church of Christ?" (P. 16 f.)

If this spirit can only become general, the union among His followers, longed and prayed for by our Great Head, surely cannot be far away. For all those who judge spiritual movements among men by their principles and motives rather than by details of interpretation or opinions, there is much, very much, to be thankful for in the Liberal Evangelical Movement in the Church of England.

"TRUE" AND "TRUTH" IN THE JOHANNINE WRITINGS

By GEERHARDUS VOS, Professor of Biblical Theology in Princeton
Theological Seminary

WE ARE accustomed to say that there is but one truth, and that what is not true is *ipso facto* false. And yet the New Testament knows of two kinds of "truth." It may be well to add immediately, that this does not mean applying the predicate "true" in an identical sense to statements that are logically contradictory and hence mutually exclusive of each other. Nor do we wish to have the doubleness understood according to the somewhat loose popular habit of affirming that the truth has various sides, so that what appears true from one point of view may seem different from another. In such a case it is not, of course, the identical thing that receives at one and the same time the opposite predicates, but only the various ingredients or aspects of the thing are described *per contraria*.

Nor, once again, do we mean to refer to the Ritschlian attempt of assigning certain complexes of things to diverse spheres, so that, for instance, in the realm of science or metaphysics a conclusion could be called false to which nevertheless the religious consciousness in the sphere of faith could feel bound to attach the opposite predicate of true, or *vice versa*.

What we mean is this: The words for true, truth, possess inherently two distinct connotations. One linguistic term serves to describe two different qualities, each carrying within itself two differently meant oppo-

sites. If there is a defect or a cause for misleading here, it is an inadequacy in the precision of the language, not in the idea or the reality of things. In excuse of the language it may be properly urged, that the two meanings expressed by the same terms have a close innate connection, so as to render the lack of distinction well-nigh unavoidable to the average popular mind. Besides, the language has made some effort, as we shall see, to mark the distinction. Nevertheless a real difference exists, and to miss it means the missing of a valuable and important item of Biblical thought.

The two meanings can with sufficient approach to correctness be expressed by the two adjectives, veracious and veritable. True, as exchangeable with veracious, belongs to the conceptual or cognitive sphere. It denotes the agreement of a concept or its expression with the reality reflected in it. Its opposite is misrepresentation (intentional or non-intentional; in the former case falsehood). From the conception or expression it is extended to the person who conceives or conveys the thought or utterance. So soon as what he believes and what he speaks differ he can no longer be strictly called true, may this be due to an inadequacy of expression, in which case no moral blame will attach, or to a designed divergence, in which case the language stigmatizes him as untruthful or hypocritical.

It is not necessary to give many examples of this ordinary cognitive meaning of the term. Two instances may suffice: To receive Jesus' testimony is to set one's seal to the veracity of God (John 3:33); and, "herein is that saying true, one soweth and another reapeth" (4:37). Especially the Old Testament in a certain usage calls attention to the moral blame attaching to an untrue state of life. In the one word *emeth* it expresses

the correctness of perception in religious things, and the loyalty to Jehovah going with or flowing from it. Thus true can become synonymous with good. This synonymity is worth noticing, because it reflects the Scriptural judgment concerning the close nexus between right religious conviction and religious rightness in general. (Cf. John 3:20-21; 7:18.)

Cognitive truth so far touched upon is something intra-mental, subjective, predicable not of things in themselves, but of conceptions or expressions about things. Without a thinking, thought-uttering subject there could be no truth of this kind in the world. Even as to God this holds true; when what He declares is truth, it is because of the absolute correspondence between His declaration and the reality of some external object or of the thought or purpose in His mind.

The second meaning, designated above by veritable, is by no means so obvious or perspicuous as the one just commented upon. In fact it is apt to startle somewhat when first brought to the attention of the Bible student. When Jesus is called "the true light" (John 1:9), or "the true bread" (6:32), this has nothing to do with His telling the truth, but may be approximately rendered "the veritable light," "the veritable bread." Veritable is that which answers to the highest conception or ideal of something. In the same way Jesus calls Himself the "true vine" and His Father the "husbandman" (15:1). Somewhat less obvious, but none the less surely intended, is the description of the ideal worshipers as "true worshipers" (4:23), although here what follows about the duty of worshiping "in spirit and in truth" has mistakenly led to interpreting "truth" by sincerity, of which more anon. In 1 John 2:8 the "true light" is not different from that of verse 9 in the Prologue of

the Gospel, and there is no reason to depart from this meaning, when in 1 John 5:20 God is twice called the *alethinos* (veritable) God.

These are all the indubitable instances from the Gospel and the First Epistle, so far as the adjective comes under consideration, but the same phenomenon can be observed in regard to the noun. When Jesus is called "the truth," it would be a rash judgment to assert that this can mean nothing else than that His words are the supreme, incarnate veracity. The noun can just as well mean, and undoubtedly, in view of the usage of the adjective, sometimes does mean, that the supreme reality of the things that compose His character is incarnate in Him. The fulness of "truth," which, side by side with "grace," resides in the Only Begotten, must mean far more than the reliability pertaining to His words; similarly the "grace and truth" which, in contrast to the law of Moses, "came (or became) through Jesus Christ," must have a wider and deeper reference, if justice is to be done to the context.

When Jesus, in 14:6, makes the triple identification between the "way," the "truth," and the "life," and Himself, the very point of the statement is missed when, as is so frequently done, the three concepts are simply co-ordinated, and the content of each unfolded separately. The context shows that what was in question was the "way" to the place whither Jesus was going. This place consisted in the house of the Father with the many mansions; He is the way to this because He Himself is bound for this. The identification with Him furnishes absolute certainty of the disciples' arriving there. This is then further made clear by the two following explicative concepts: He is specifically the truth, the veritable essence of that region to which He

is going; and within that essence again He is the life characteristically belonging to it. Somewhat more doubtful, but on the whole pointing in the same direction, is the description of believers as being "out of the truth" (John 18:37. Cf. 1 John 3:19), and of being made "free by the truth" (John 8:32. Cf. vs. 36: "If the Son therefore shall make you free").

It will be observed that most of the instances in which this notion of veritableness occurs are from the Gospel and the First Epistle. In the two smaller Epistles it is not in evidence, which, considering the small size and the more particular purpose of these two documents, can hardly cause surprise. But neither do we meet with it in the Apocalypse, a book of no such small extent. Possibly this is to be explained from the prophetic, strongly asseverative style here prevailing, since this naturally attracts the use of the adjective to the emphatic affirmation of the veracity of God and of Christ (cf. Rev. 3: 7, 14; 15:3; 16:7; 19:2, 9, 11; 21:5; 22:6). This shows itself in the fact, also, that *pistos*, "faithful," repeatedly appears as its synonym.

The idea, "veritable," is so general as to render necessary the question, wherein the veritableness consists, or what is its cause. On this we obtain light by observing that the veritable things appear in a more or less clear association with Heaven. The proximate definition is a local one. A rapid survey of the passages will bear this out. Not confining ourselves now to the Johannine writings, in which, to be sure, the bulk of the evidence appears, we note, first, Luke 16:11, toward the close of the parable of the dishonest steward. Here Jesus puts the question: "If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true?" The adjective

alethinos needs to have repeated with it from the former half of the sentence "mammon," meaning riches. There can be little doubt as to what these "veritable riches" are. They are the riches laid up in Heaven. (*Cf.* Matt. 6: 19-21.) In this particular case what corresponds to them is the asset of assurance of a glad welcome in "the everlasting habitations" from those befriended on earth. "The veritable light" of John 1:9 is represented as a light "coming into the world," that is, from Heaven. This appears to be by far the preferable construction. The conclusion would not follow, of course, in case "coming into the world" were joined to "every man."

In John 4:23 the ideal worshipers are those who seek and adore God in His Heavenly reality and habitation. At first sight the injection of the celestial element here might seem to be uncalled for, and the idea of "spirit" fully sufficient as a qualitative definition of the worship foretold, but verse 21 proves that a detachment from earthly localities and limitations is essential to the completion of the thought of worship "in truth." Nor is the mention of "spirit" in this connection by any means unmotivated, for at bottom spirit expresses the element, the atmosphere, wherein the Heavenly reality consists. It is not improbable that here (as "grace and truth" in John 1:14, 17) "spirit and truth" must be understood on the principle of a hendiadys, equivalent to "spirit which is truth," spirit in its Heavenly manifestation.

The association between the "veritable" character of Jesus' flesh as meat indeed and His blood as drink indeed (John 6:55) must have something to do with the emphasis placed throughout the context on the provenience of Jesus from Heaven. The failure to understand this correctly is in part due to the loose

translation, "bread indeed," "drink indeed," instead of "true bread," "true drink," as the Greek has. In fact verse 32, and, following in this same chapter, 35 come near to a formal definition of what "veritableness," predicated of bread, signifies: "Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven." Decisive is, with personal reference to Jesus: "The bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven and giveth life to the world." That this is meant in the literal sense appears from the murmuring of the Jews against it, in verse 42, where it is by them opposed to Jesus' being the son of Joseph. No less emphatic and unequivocal is the statement of verses 50 and 51: "This is the bread which cometh down from heaven that a man may eat thereof and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever, and the bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world." The statement seems to verge on the idea, that there is a close connection between the descent from heaven and the life-giving power of the bread, and suggests the somewhat analogous representation of Paul in 1 Corinthians 15:45, 47 to the effect that Christ is the Lord from Heaven, and as such a quickening Spirit.

The two passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews which use "veritable" in the same specific sense, 8:2 and 9:24, even more pointedly identify it with "in heaven." It here is a technical term belonging to the typological system of the Epistle, according to which the ritual things on earth are reflections, down-shadowings, of the ritual in Heaven. The "holy places made with hands" are the figures of "the true," that is, the Heavenly, places. Nor is this parallelism in Hebrews confined to

the ritual comparison. It rests on the broader theological background of the co-existence of two strata of creation. (Cf. Heb. 9:11, "not of this creation;" 12:22, "the heavenly Jerusalem.") Still in Hebrews the terminology of "veritableness" remains confined to the ceremonial contrast.

In John, on the other hand, the general theological background on which the distinction between true and its opposite rests is drawn in broader lines. "Veritableness" in its full, wide-ranging import cannot be comprehended here until it is placed in the light of the thorough bisection of the universe that dominates this teaching both in the discourse of Jesus and the reflection of it in certain statements of the Evangelist. A regular *schema* of contrasts with closely related forms of expression may here be recognized. It serves the formulation of the most pervasive and clean-cut differentiation between the natural and the supernatural found anywhere in Scripture. On the one side stand "the kosmos" ("this kosmos,") "the earth," "the earthly things," "the things beneath;" over against these stand "heaven," "the heavenly things," "the things above." It will be noticed that this scheme lacks completeness only in that the term, that world, for the supernal region is not employed. The reason probably lies in the evil connotation which the word "kosmos" must have early acquired, since Paul also abstains from its use as a designation of the future eschatological state. Too pointed to be overlooked is its avoidance by Jesus in John 8:23: "Ye are from beneath; I am from above: ye are of this world; *I am not of this world*," instead of, I am of that world. But apart from this, the terms named all imply the superiority and precedence of the higher sphere, and in so far

entitle it to the predicate of "veritableness," even where this is not explicitly combined with it as it is in other passages.

And this supernaturalism is all-embracing; it is more than the remedial and sporadic supernaturalism of redemption which restores the normality of things disturbed by sin; while including the latter, it reaches out much farther into the structure and reconstruction of creation on the largest of scales. The destiny appointed for man is to ascend from the lower to the higher. Because man fell out of the latter through the deflection of sin, the supreme Representative of Heaven had to descend and restore the harmony of the pristine appurtenance. The parallelism sometimes runs athwart the antithesis of redemption. In John 3:12 the birth from above, soterically speaking a thoroughly supernatural event, is none the less classified with the "earthly things" of which Jesus had been discoursing with Nicodemus, evidently because our Lord places above it, as still more absolutely pertaining to "the heavenly things," a yet higher birth, of the nature of which it were perhaps presumptuous in us to endeavor to form a concrete conception, although it has led theologians, and not merely ultra-dogmatic ones, but likewise some ultra-philosophical critical exegetes of the Gospel, to assume a reference by way of indirection to what is theologically called the eternal generation of the Son by the Father within the Godhead.

It is further noteworthy that in certain contexts of the Gospel the truth of Jesus' witness is significantly associated with His pre-existence, that is, with His original abode in the sphere of Heaven. This, however, refers rather to the "veracity" of His Person and words than to their "veritableness," so that, strictly

speaking, it falls outside of the present discussion. Still it may be remembered, that, in so far as the things spoken in witness are information brought down from Heaven, "things heard and seen" by Jesus, they would be at the same time "veracious" and things concerning the "veritable," so that the two conceptions would practically flow together. (*Cf.* John 3:12, 13, 19, 21, 31-33; 8:14; 17:17; 18:36; 1 John 2:8; 5:21.) It cannot be otherwise than that the words of Him who is by nature and origin the "veritable" One should partake of the same character precisely because they are His. His Kingdom is not of this world (but of the Heavenly world), and for this very reason He came from the higher into the lower world that He should bear witness unto "the truth," and that every one that is of "the truth" should hear His voice (18:37).

The precise connotation can in some instances be tested by the terms appropriate to what is opposite to "the truth." When in 1 Thessalonians 1:9 Paul speaks of the readers having turned from idols "to serve the living and true God," the opposite is, of course, "false gods," but one immediately feels that in this "false" a totally different judgment is expressed than that of the untruthfulness of the pagan divinities. The idea is obviously, that, if not absolutely the existence, at least the proper reality and power belonging to the divine are denied to these so-called gods. In this sense the Christian God is "the only *alethinos* God" (John 18:3); what the opposite means Paul has succinctly expressed in calling the pristine objects of worship of the Galatians such as "by nature are no gods" (Gal. 4:8). The ordinary meaning of "false" can certainly not be applied to the Law with which the grace and truth come by Christ are contrasted. For it is said of this Law that

it was given "through Moses." The use of "through" instead of "by" presupposes that Moses was only the instrument in giving the Law, and this again has for its supposition that the actual lawgiver was none other than God (John 1:17). And this of itself refutes the charge of Gnostic tendencies sometimes brought against the Gospel, particularly on the basis of this passage.

The Law was not yet the highest, antitypical grace which was necessary to constitute it "truth;" it was typical adumbration, but it was not on that account "false" in the invidious sense. The contrast is the same as the Epistle to the Hebrews expresses in 10:1: "The law having a shadow of good things to come, not the very *eikon* of the things," etc. But the Gnostics maintained that the Law was "false," deceptive, void of veracity. The utmost charge that the New Testament (Paul, Hebrews, John) brings against the Law relates to its inefficacy; hence in the passage just quoted from Hebrews the author adds "can never . . . make perfect." The worship in spirit and truth, to which our Lord points the Samaritan woman forward, has not for its opposite a totally "false" worship. At least with reference to the worship observed by the Jews in Jerusalem it is said by Jesus, "We worship that which we know." The reason given for this is, that "salvation is from the Jews." The dispensation that gives birth to salvation must be absolutely "veracious"; the good cannot come out of the evil. And it ought to be noted that Jesus by use of the plural pronoun "we" explicitly includes Himself in the number of those who worship according to the Old Testament rule, a thing impossible to conceive had He, or the Evangelist for that matter, regarded this rule as "false" in the odious sense.

Because of its pervasive construction of the universe

on the principle of two strata and its derivation of the highest ideal and redemptive things from on high, the Fourth Gospel may be justly characterized as the most intensely anti-evolutionistic document in the New Testament, so far as the derivation of the origin and progress of religion is concerned. Nevertheless refuge is sometimes had in it as an arsenal furnishing evolutionistic ammunition. Those who employ this method must be indeed hard up for a text on which to hang their modern, quasi-scientific fashion of teaching or preaching.

Not long ago an academic preacher distilled evolution from the statement in John 10:10, "I am come that they might have life, and might have it more abundantly." There are at least a score, if not more, passages in the Gospel which emphasize that the life represented and communicated by Jesus does not grow up from beneath, but descends from above, and receives its increase from above. The slightest scientifically exegetical and historical acquaintance with the document ought to have protected against such a caricature. In John 8:23 Jesus claims for Himself, in the most unequivocal manner, His not being from beneath, but from above. He is simply "not of this world." And what is true of Jesus is, of course, on the principles of the Johannine teaching throughout, in the statements both of Jesus and of the Evangelist, applicable to the disciples, for in no document is the identification of Jesus with the believer more emphatically affirmed. Hence the strand that runs through the Gospel tracing the detachment of the disciples from "the world" back to the choice or love or the gift of God from eternity.

It were a mistake, however, to conceive of the contrast as primarily intended to convey philosophical ideas. The difference between "the true things" and

"the not-true things" is not conceived after a Platonic or Philonic fashion. The world above is not called "true" as though it contained a higher reality of being in the substantial metaphysical sense. Both spheres are equally real. The difference comes in through an appraisal of quality and importance. What is practically involved is the principle of ultimate spiritual value in regard to destiny. The practical name for this is the principle of "otherworldliness."

In conclusion a few words may be added as to the effort of the language to mark the differences of conception involved by the use of specific words. Only to a partial degree does such effort show itself. The language had no means in the noun form to express the difference between "veraciousness" and "veritableness." Here the one word *aletheia* had to render service for both. For distinguishing these two concepts in their adjectival form, two words were available, or rather one word with two endings, a weaker and a stronger one. From the one stem spring *alethes* and *alethinos*. As the prolonged ending with the long vowel in the penult indicates, the latter is the stronger, intensified form.

Now, in the abstract it would have been possible to allot one of these two forms to the one meaning, the other to the other. But words and word-forms are not so mechanically parcelled out. A form carrying peculiar intensity will as a rule cling to the general idea in every one of its shades of meaning, and render its service of intensifying impartially. So it has happened here. The intensifying word *alethinos*, instead of binding itself to the meaning, veritable, which is doubtless the more intense one, if the two meanings be conceptually compared, has not separated itself from the meaning "veracious." It has been continued in use

where the necessity of saying "intensely veracious" offered itself. (Cf. John 4:37; 7:28; 8:16; 19:35; Rev. 15:3; 16:7; 19:2; 9:11; 21:5; 22:6.)

But, while veracious can on occasion acquire this emphatic meaning, which summons the intensifying *alethinos* to its aid, the concept, veritable, carries the intensity in itself, and consequently makes regular use of *alethinos* for expression. There is but one instance of the sense, veritable, where *alethinos* is not employed, viz., John 6:55¹. To that extent, and to that only, it may be affirmed that to veritableness corresponds in the Greek of the New Testament *alethinos*. But we must be careful not to reverse this by saying, as some expositors have done, that *alethinos* uniformly means *veritable*, in the technical meaning defined in this paper.

¹ If we could follow the ordinary rendering of both A. V. and R. V., "my flesh is meat *indeed*"; "my blood is drink *indeed*," this one exception would fall away. But a comparison with the original will show, that not the adverb *alethos* is read here, but the adjective *alethes*. The latter cannot mean indeed. At the same time the context forbids giving it any lower meaning than veritable. The exception therefore stands.

THE FOUNDATION AND THE SEAL

2 TIMOTHY 2:19

By PHILIP MAURO

THE verse that contains the subject of the present inquiry reads thus:

Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his. And, Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity.

What is "the foundation of God," referred to in this verse? And what the "seal" thereof? The present inquiry will be directed almost entirely to the second of these questions, since there is little room for doubt, in the light of the context and of other Scriptures presently to be cited, that Jesus Christ is this "foundation of God." What then is the seal that has been affixed to this Foundation?

From the punctuation of the verse as it stands in our common versions it is evident that the translators regarded the seal as being composed of the two clauses that follow: (1) "The Lord knoweth them that are his"; and (2) "Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity." This interpretation, however, depends entirely upon the punctuation. To my mind another explanation is demanded, since I find it impossible to conceive how the two clauses just quoted could constitute, or answer any of the known purposes of, a seal. And even if one could conceive of a seal, of any sort whatever, composed of these two clauses, there remains the further difficulty that they bear no such

relation to "the foundation of God" as a seal bears to the object whereto it is affixed.

"THE FOUNDATION OF GOD"

Logically, therefore, the first step in our present study is to determine with all possible certainty what is meant by "the foundation of God," which "standeth sure." It is easy to do this both from the context and from other Scriptures. Reserving the context for later consideration, I call attention first of all to Paul's words in another Epistle, where it is written: "According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise masterbuilder, *I have laid the foundation*, and another buildeth thereon. . . . For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." (1 Cor. 3:10-11.)

This passage alone, by its clearness and force, is sufficient to settle the meaning of the phrase, "foundation of God," in any doubtful instance (if there were any such) in the writings of Paul. But by way of redundant confirmation I refer to Isaiah 28:16: "Behold, I lay in Zion *for a foundation*, a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, *a sure foundation*: he that believeth shall not make haste."

The Apostle Peter quotes this passage and applies it to Jesus Christ (1 Pet. 2:4-6). Paul also refers to it in Romans 9:33 and 10:11, where he cites it to prove that Jesus Christ is the true Foundation of saving faith; and where, in both passages, he quotes the concluding part of the verse thus: "Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed," making definite what in the original is indefinite. Moreover Paul doubtless had the Isaiah passage before his mind in writing the verse we are now studying. For in Isaiah it is God who says, "I

lay in Zion for a foundation"; and here we have a phrase of corresponding meaning, "the foundation of *God*." I purpose to return to this passage later for light upon the question, What is the "seal" that God has set upon His "foundation," to make it "sure."

THE SEAL

Attempts have been made to construe and apply the two concluding clauses of 2 Timothy 2:19 in such a way that they might assume the aspect of a seal and answer, after a fashion at least, the purpose thereof. Thus it has been said that we have here a two-sided seal; that the words, "The Lord knoweth them that are his," constitute the God-ward side of the seal; and that the words, "Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity," constitute the man-ward side thereof.

But this to me is utterly unintelligible. I am unable to form any conception of a seal having a God-ward side and a man-ward side; and I know of no such contrivance either in the Bible or out of it. Such a thing as a tablet or medal, or even a seal, having an inscription on each of its two sides is common enough. But that does not help us to comprehend an authenticating "seal" composed of two clauses, or sentences, such as those we are considering. And furthermore the verse does not suggest that the words quoted are inscribed on opposite sides of a seal, or on anything. The first clause (or more properly, I think, complete sentence) is a simple statement of fact, "The Lord knoweth them that are his." The second is just a plan and practical exhortation addressed to all who "name the name of Christ." Neither the one nor the other could conceivably answer the purposes of a seal. And still more of an impossibility would it be for these two utterly unlike clauses to

be combined into one device, to serve the single purpose of a seal to God's Foundation.

Considered apart from the previous portion of the verse, the meaning of those two clauses is plain. Their relation to the context is also clear. Thus, there might well be uncertainty in our minds as to whether the persons referred to in verse 17 belong to Christ or not, but "the Lord knoweth them that are his." And then, in view of the "profane and vain babblings" and the "ungodliness" of verse 16, it is obviously appropriate that the Apostle should admonish those who name the Name of Christ to "depart from iniquity." The verse presents no difficulty until one attempts mentally to combine the two dissimilar groups of words into one "seal," and then to imagine how such a seal could serve as the authentication of God's "foundation."

If then those several clauses are not the seal of God's Foundation, what is meant by the phrase, "this seal"? The answer I propose is that the seal of God's Foundation is the *Resurrection*. This I shall first endeavor to establish by other Scriptures, especially the writings of Paul; and will then seek to show that the passage itself, 2 Timothy 2:8-21, agrees thereto.

THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF A SEAL

First let us ascertain just what a seal is, and for what purposes it was used in Bible times. Seals were well known and quite commonly used in those days. The material of which a seal was made might be wax, clay or other plastic substance; and it might be affixed directly to the thing that was to be sealed, or be attached to it by means of ribbons. But what made it a "seal," and fitted it to perform the function thereof, was the distinctive mark, inscription or pictorial device, im-

pressed upon the plastic substance. Thus it was adapted to afford conclusive evidence of the origin, or the ownership, of the object to which it was affixed. Or, as in the case of a letter, a document, a royal decree or other state paper, the seal was the evidence of its genuineness. The seal authenticated the document to all who might see it, and gave to it the authority of the one whose the seal was. In the case, for instance, of letters or decrees sent forth by royal command the seal carried with it the authority of the monarch himself.

The device for making the impression was called a "signet." This was usually set in a ring, hence the term "signet-ring." Its use goes back to very early times (Gen. 38:18; Ex. 28:11, 21; 39:14). So great was the importance of a seal in those days that a document would not be regarded as valid or genuine if the seal were lacking. And the custom obtains to this day in regard to state papers and documents of an official character, as well as to conveyances and other important business papers. In olden times, therefore, the signet-ring was part of a man's ordinary personal wear (Gen. 38:18).

Examples of the use of seals for the purposes of authentication and to furnish proof of genuineness are found in the case of Jezebel, who "wrote letters in Ahab's name, and sealed them with his seal" (1 Kings 21:8), and in the instance of the letters sent at the instigation of Haman to the governors of the provinces of the Persian Empire, which letters were "sealed with the king's seal" (Esther 3:12).

A different, but analogous, use of a seal is seen in Revelation 7:4-8, where we read of the servants of God who were sealed in their foreheads. The seal served in that case to mark and identify them in a conspicuous way as belonging to God. So likewise they who have

been saved through faith in Jesus Christ were, when they believed, "sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise" (Eph. 1:13; see also 2 Cor. 1:22).

It appears, therefore, that the main purpose of a seal was to afford evidence of the genuineness or authenticity of that to which it was affixed, and thus to make it sure. Hence we have to ascertain what it is which makes it "sure," so that we can depend upon it as indubitable truth, that Jesus Christ is the veritable "foundation of God," and not a false Messiah.

It should not, however, be overlooked that seals were also used in ancient times, as today, to close a house, a chamber, a book or the like, in order to prevent its unauthorized opening. Thus we have "a book that is sealed" (Isa. 29:11); and "The words are closed up and sealed unto the time of the end" (Dan. 12:9); again, "sealing the stone and setting a watch" (Matt. 27:66); and again, a book "sealed with seven seals" (Rev. 5:1). But the Foundation of God could hardly have a seal in this sense.

It must be specially noted that a seal, in order that it may serve its intended purpose, must be so completely identified with its owner as to be readily and surely recognized. In other words the seal must plainly declare its owner, so that it may command the respect due to him. For unless the seal unmistakable proves the ownership or origin of the object to which it is affixed it would be worthless. The seal therefore must needs be a mark or sign which none but the owner could affix. God's seal must be something which affords infallible proof to all that the object sealed thereby is truly God's. It must be a mark that none but God could affix. Tested by this requirement it becomes yet more evident that the two concluding clauses of verse 19 could not

serve as a seal to God's Foundation, or indeed to anything.

JESUS AND THE RESURRECTION

It is one of the clearest doctrines of the Bible that Jesus Christ is the Foundation Stone upon which God builds His eternal habitation, His "spiritual house." Proof of this has been given in passages cited above. In addition let me recall our Lord's own words, "On this rock I will build my church" (Matt. 16:18), and those spoken by Him to the chief priests and elders at Jerusalem, "The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing" (Matt. 21:42). And reference should be made also to the "habitation of God" of which Paul writes in Ephesians 2:20-22, that "holy temple in the Lord," which is now being "built *upon the foundation* of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." These Scriptures are specially pertinent because the same conception of a house, built upon "the foundation of God," is found in the passage we are considering. For the very next verses go on to speak of a "great house," of "the master" of the house, and of "vessels" of various sorts therein. To this we will come later.

And now, preliminaries having received the attention they required, we are ready for the question, What seal, or in other words, what divine certification has been given, that Jesus of Nazareth is indeed the Christ, the Foundation of God? Surely that which answers to a seal, in this sense, is the fact that *God has raised Him from the dead*. The two words, "Jesus" and "resurrection," contain the sum and substance of the Gospel preached by the apostles, the message that "turned the world upside down" (Acts 4:33; 17:3, 6, 18, etc.). The

word "Jesus" designates God's Foundation, and "the resurrection" declares the seal thereof. The resurrection of Christ was God's answer to the "seal" of the Roman Empire, placed by Pilate's command upon His tomb, whereby it was proposed to "make it sure" (Matt. 27:65-66) that His body should not be removed. Thus the supreme power of the world sought, as it were, to seal *Him* forever within the regions of the dead. But God, by "the exceeding greatness of his power," raised Him again into life (Eph. 1:19). And thereby *God's seal* was set to Him as the "Living Stone" laid in Zion, the true Foundation of God's "Spiritual House" (1 Pet. 2:5).

THE WITNESS OF THE APOSTLES TO THE RESURRECTION

The resurrection of Jesus Christ was the prominent feature, the very essence indeed, of the preaching and teaching of the apostles. At the beginning of the book of Acts it is recorded that, because the number of the apostles had been diminished by the apostasy of Judas, Peter announced to the disciples that one must be ordained to be "*a witness with us of his resurrection*" (Acts 1:16-22). We find also these words spoken publicly by the chief of the apostles: "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses" (2:32), and, "whom God hath raised from the dead, whereof we are witnesses" (3:15). Also these historical items: "They taught the people and preached through Jesus the resurrection of the dead" (4:2), "And with great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus" (4:33).

And when later on Saul of Tarsus was converted and was sent forth by the risen Lord Himself with apostolical authority, he too "laid the foundation" of

the faith of Christ among the Gentiles by preaching "Jesus and the resurrection" (Acts 17:18). In all these Scriptures we find both the Foundation of God—Jesus Christ, and also the authenticating seal thereof—the Resurrection.

In Paul's first recorded address he announced the glad tidings, that God had fulfilled the promise (of salvation) made to the fathers of Israel "in that he hath raised up Jesus again, as it is also written in the second psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee" (Acts 13:32-33). Here is a clear statement, that it was by raising up Jesus from the dead that God gave proof, or, so to speak, *set to His seal*, that Jesus is indeed the Christ, the Son of God. Likewise also when Peter had confessed Jesus to be the One spoken of in the Second Psalm (using the words of the Psalm, though not naming it), our Lord immediately declared Himself to be the Rock upon which He would build His church, and began from that time to make known His approaching death and resurrection (Matt. 16:15-21). This further goes to show that the Resurrection is the "seal" that God has set upon His "sure foundation."

To the same effect are the words of Romans 1:4; Jesus Christ our Lord, "declared the Son of God with power . . . by the resurrection from the dead."

This tells us that Jesus Christ was "declared," or marked out as, or certified to be, the Son of God, by the Resurrection. This is equivalent to saying that, by raising up Jesus Christ from the dead, God set to His seal, or gave full assurance, that He truly is the Son of God. And it makes little or no difference for our present purposes whether we adopt the Authorized Version's reading, "the resurrection *from* the dead," or that of the Revised Version, "the resurrection *of* the dead."

Further it is recorded that our Lord, after His resurrection, opened the understanding of His disciples, and said, "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved [was necessary for] Christ to suffer and to rise again from the dead the third day" (Luke 24:44, 46), which is the same as saying that His rising from the dead proved Him to be "the Christ."

And Paul, later on, applied the Scriptures in the very same way, and that, moreover, was his customary manner of preaching ("as his manner was"). For it is recorded (Act 17:1-3) that, speaking in the synagogue at Thessalonica, he first showed from the Scripture that the Christ foretold therein "must needs have suffered and risen again from the dead"; and then he declared that Jesus of Nazareth ("this Jesus whom we preach unto you") had been raised from the dead (whereof there were hundreds of witnesses then living) and therefore was "the Christ." So here again is an appeal to the resurrection of Jesus as the seal whereby He is certified and accredited to all mankind as the sure Foundation of God.

I have reserved to the last the passage which, as it seems to me, bears the clearest testimony of all to the fact that the seal of God's Foundation is the Resurrection. It has been noted already that Paul at Athens preached "Jesus and the resurrection" (Acts 17:18). And now I direct attention specially to the concluding words of his address on Mars' Hill, where he proclaimed that now God commands all men everywhere to repent: "Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath *given assurance* unto all men in that he hath *raised him from the dead*" (Acts 17:31).

The word here rendered "assurance" is literally proof. So that we have in this passage the solemn assertion that the raising up of Jesus Christ from the dead is the seal, the incontestable proof, that He is the One whom God has ordained to judge the whole habitable earth.

Thus we have found it to be the teaching of the New Testament, set forth in many passages, that the Resurrection is that which answers to the nature, purpose, and office of a seal, in that it accredits and certifies Jesus of Nazareth to be the Christ, the sure Foundation of God. And it may be confidently added that there is nothing else in the Bible that answers at all as a seal, or divine authentication, to Jesus Christ as the Foundation of God.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE PASSAGE ITSELF

Therefore it is now in order to examine the context of the verse we are studying, to see whether or not it agrees with the conclusion we have reached. In my opinion it strongly confirms that conclusion. Here is the entire passage, 2 Timothy 2:7-19:

7. "Consider what I say; and the Lord give thee understanding in all things. [8] Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead according to my gospel: [9] Wherein I suffer trouble, as an evil-doer, even unto bonds; but the word of God is not bound. [10] Therefore I endure all things for the elect's sake, that they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory. [11] It is a faithful saying: For if we be dead with him, we shall also live with him: [12] If we suffer, we shall also reign with him: if we deny him, he will also deny us: [13] If we believe not, yet he abideth faithful: he can-

not deny himself. [14] Of these things put them in remembrance, charging them before the Lord that they strive not about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers. [15] Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. [16] But shun profane and vain babblings; for they will increase unto more ungodliness. [17] And their word will eat as doth a canker: of whom is Hymeneus and Philetus; [18] Who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some. [19] Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his. And, Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity. [20] But in a great house there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth; and some to honor, and some to dishonor. [21] If a man therefore purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honor, sanctified, and meet for the master's use, and prepared unto every good work."

The general theme of the passage is *the Gospel*, which Paul designates "my gospel" (v. 8), and which he calls also "the word of God" (v. 9), "the word of truth" (v. 15), and "the truth" (v. 18). Its substance is concisely stated—"Jesus Christ . . . raised from the dead" (v. 8), and Timothy is exhorted to "remember" it. In verse 14, moreover, he is charged to put others "in remembrance" of "these things." Paul preaches this Gospel, and suffers trouble because of it, "for the elect's sake," to the end that they may obtain salvation (v. 10). But he does not shrink from such sufferings because, if we die with Christ, we shall also live with Him; and if we suffer with Him, we shall here-

after reign with Him. On the other hand, if we deny Him, He also will deny us (vs. 11-12). Thus God is faithful to reward those who believe and who serve in the Gospel; but on the other hand, He is faithful in dealing with them that "believe not"; for "He cannot deny himself" (12-13). There are those who serve in the Gospel, workmen approved unto God, who hold a straight course in the word of truth (15). But there is also another class, whose discourses are but "profane and vain babblings" (16). Of the former class two are presented to view in this passage, Paul and Timothy; and of the latter class also two are named, Hymeneus and Philetus (17). And the central point of their doctrinal error is stated: They have erred concerning the truth of the Gospel, "saying *that the resurrection is past already*"; and the effect is to "overthrow the faith of some" (literally, overthrowing or overturning) (18).

And this introduces the thought of verse 19, namely, that notwithstanding the overturning or subverting of the faith of some (who had taken their stand upon the truth of the Gospel, Jesus Christ, God's Foundation, raised from the dead) *the Foundation itself* stood firm, and the attesting *seal* (the Resurrection) made it "sure." It was in regard to "the resurrection" that the two named in verse 17 had erred, not that they denied it, but merely entertained an erroneous view regarding it. To this we will return. And the Apostle goes on to say that, not only does the Foundation of God remain unshaken, but there is "a great house" reared upon it. In that house there is place and use for vessels of different sorts, some (vessels unto honor) representing the one class of persons referred to in the preceding verses, and some (vessels unto dishonor) representing the other

class (v. 20). And from this a further practical lesson is drawn (v. 21).

Thus, as we run our eyes rapidly over the entire passage, we see that it contains a definite line of teaching, which can be traced from the beginning to the end; and that the subject of the Gospel, "Jesus Christ . . . raised from the dead," is carried without a break from verse 8 to verse 19.

It is in agreement with all that is recorded of Paul's preaching in the book of Acts, and with all the teaching of his Epistles as well, that he should lay stress, in this final charge to Timothy, upon the two vital elements of the Gospel, "*Jesus and the resurrection.*" For it is not preaching "the gospel of God concerning his Son" (Rom. 1:1-4) merely to preach Jesus Christ, as for instance, some preach and extol Him today as a teacher of truth whereby men may advance in knowledge and holiness, or as an example after which they may pattern their own lives. The Gospel of God, preached by the apostles, was a message of *fact*, "how that Christ died for our sins, according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures" (1 Cor. 15:3-4). And in verses 14-19 of the same chapter the Apostle sets forth reasons of the weightiest character to prove that the Resurrection is the vital, all-important, indispensable element of the Gospel, without which there would be no Gospel, no salvation, no hope for mankind; without which our faith would be vain, we would be yet in our sins, the dead in Christ would have perished, and we would be of all men the most miserable—because the most deluded.

And here (1 Cor. 15:23), moreover, Paul reveals a detail of the teaching of the New Testament concerning the Resurrection which it is important to note for the

a better understanding of 2 Timothy 2:17-19. The detail is that, while the believer in Christ has a present share in His resurrection and partakes even now of the eternal life that is in Him (Eph. 2:5; Col. 2:12, etc.), the bodily resurrection of the believer himself is yet future, and will take place "at his coming." For then "the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible" (1 Cor. 15:52). This detail of the truth is very important. *It was in regard thereto that Hymeneus and Philetus had erred.*

Therefore, from the passage itself we may fairly conclude that the phrase, "this seal," refers to the Resurrection, which is first mentioned in the passage in verse 8. The fact that there are a number of verses between the 8th and 19th is not a serious difficulty, especially when we recall that digressions of considerable length and latitude are common in Paul's writings. In this case, moreover, it is easy to trace the continuity of thought through all the intervening verses.

As we have seen, the subject of the Gospel ("Jesus and the resurrection") is carried down to verse 18; and in that verse "the resurrection" is expressly referred to as that element of the Gospel in regard to which the two persons there named had erred. And then immediately follow the words, "Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal." The connecting word, "nevertheless," requires that we look to the preceding context for the explanation of the phrase, "this seal"; and such being the case, we are manifestly shut up to the conclusion that the seal of God's Foundation is the Resurrection.

It should be noted in passing that Hymeneus and Philetus had not denied the Resurrection, but had erred concerning it. They had not said, as did the Sadducees,

that there was "no resurrection" (Acts 23:8), but that it was "past already," thus inferentially denying that the bodies of the saints shall rise. And this might involve also the denial that our Lord's resurrection was a bodily resurrection, an error that is quite common in our days.

Assuming the foregoing explanation of verse 19 to be correct, the punctuation should be changed by placing a full stop after "seal." No other change is called for.

THE "GREAT HOUSE"

Verses 20 and 21 do not strictly come within the scope of our enquiry; but they belong to the passage we are studying, and therefore a brief consideration of their contents is appropriate. Those verses are linked to verse 19 by the connecting word, "but," and the line of thought now passes from "the foundation" to the "great house" that is built upon it. The use made by the Apostle of this figure is to illustrate what he had said concerning two classes of persons who are professedly within the household of faith, and to enforce thereby a practical lesson. He seizes upon a difference which existed in those days between the ordinary dwelling of one in the common walks of life, and "a great house," that is, the mansion of a person of wealth and distinction. The difference was, that in the former there were but few utensils for domestic purposes, so that a single vessel had often to serve for various uses—perhaps the entire meal would be cooked in a single dish and served on the table in the same dish—whereas in "a great house" are vessels of various materials, sorts, and sizes, severally adapted to different kinds of domestic service. In a great house, moreover, would be vessels of costly material. "gold and silver," set apart specially for the

master's personal use. There would also be vessels of earthenware or common material, assigned to uses which, though necessary, are not enviable. As expressed in the passage, there would be "some to honor, and some to dishonor."

Thus the Apostle seems to be saying that among the followers of Christ there are various sorts of persons, differing greatly from one another in respect to spirituality, knowledge of the truth, manner of life, devotedness to the Lord, and other characteristics. There are those who live close to Him walking in communion with Him, and hence becoming more and more like Him in character and conduct. And there are those who live close to the world, and strongly resemble its citizens. But the Apostle seems to teach, that, despite so great differences, they are all in the same house, and being presumably members of "the household of faith," they are to be treated as such. Moreover, the illustration used by the Apostle gives us to understand that God will have some service for all. But there will be a great difference. Even to men like the two of verse 17 God will assign a service of some sort; but it will be of a very different kind from that entrusted to devoted and faithful servants of Christ.

The passage has been used to support a doctrine and practice of "separation" that savors strongly of phariseism. But it teaches rather the contrary; namely, that just as in a great house are vessels of many sorts and kinds, assigned to uses of different character, some honorable, some otherwise, even so among the followers of Christ there are great differences in respect to spirituality and behavior, yet "the Lord knoweth [or acknowledgeth] them that are his," and will find a use for all, even the most ignorant, the most wayward, the most

worldly. For while there is indeed a great difference between the dish out of which the master of the house eats, and the pail into which the scraps are thrown, and between the golden chalice he takes in his hand, and the ash can or coal scuttle, nevertheless all are in the same house, and each has a service to perform therein.

In Ezekiel 44:10-24 will be found a situation corresponding to the Apostle's illustration of the several kinds of vessels in a great house. For there God speaks of two classes of Levites (servants). First He refers to those who had been unfaithful to Him when the children of Israel went astray, saying, "They shall even bear their iniquity. Yet they shall be ministers in my sanctuary." But He assigns them to a service far from the place of His Presence, that is "at the gates," and of a menial character (vs. 10-12). And concerning them He says, "They shall not come near me, . . . nor come near to any of my holy things." But concerning those who, like Paul, were faithful in times of stress and danger, God says, "They shall enter into my sanctuary, and they shall come *near to my table*, to minister unto *me*" (vs. 13-16).

VESSELS UNTO HONOR

We come now to the practical application of the lesson. This is found in 2 Timothy 2:21. It should certainly be the ambition of every servant of Christ to become "a vessel unto honor, sanctified, meet for the master's use, prepared unto every good work." Heed should therefore be given to the one condition to be fulfilled, which is expressed in the words, "If a man therefore purge himself from these." But here a difficulty presents itself in that there is uncertainty as to the meaning of the relative pronoun "these." Some take it as masculine, mean-

ing these persons, and refer it to Hymeneus and Philetus. But it might be taken as neuter (the form being the same) and read "these things," in which case it would refer to the "profane and vain babblings," "strifes of words," false teachings, "ungodliness," and "iniquity," of the context. This latter view is favored by the word "purge," which is the intensive form of a word of frequent occurrence in the New Testament. This intensive form is found only here and in 1 Corinthians 5:7. It means to purge *out of one's self*. And obviously a man can purge out of himself only what is within him.

Furthermore, the word "purge out" has plainly an appropriate application to vessels of domestic service, whereas it certainly would not have been chosen to express the idea of withdrawing one's self from the society of other persons.

FRAMINGHAM, MASSACHUSETTS.

ST. PAUL AND SENECA

By E. G. SIHLER

EVEN before the time of Jerome of Stridon, composer of the Latin Vulgate, protégé of Bishop Damasus of Rome, and before the epoch of his younger contemporary, Augustine—even then the pious fraud of a correspondence between Paul and Seneca was in existence and was widely believed.¹ Both were in or near Rome in the years 61-63 A.D., Seneca in his *Nomentanum* or *Albanum*; in the winter or spring he seems often to have sojourned in one of his other villas, near Puteoli, on the Gulf of Naples.

Now it is true that Seneca, who strove for a certain universality of cultural outlook and gathered suggestions, in his fine library, from every kind of source, has written many things which do remind one often of Christian ethics. As for the "correspondence," say of 62-63 A.D. or so, I might content myself by transcribing the judgment of that great Christian scholar, Dr. Lightfoot: "The poverty of thought and style, the errors in chronology and history, and the whole conception of the relative positions of the Stoic philosopher and the Christian apostle, betray clearly the hand of the forger."² We cannot dwell here on Lightfoot's parallels, but will present some of our own observations in the conclusion of this monograph. Utterly farfetched is Dr. Light-

¹ See *Catalogus* of Jerome; and Augustine. The latter, it is true, merely said that such letters "are read" (*Epistolae* 153, 14).

² Commentary on Philippians, 1869, Dissertation 2, St. Paul and Seneca, p. 269, where many references to previous studies are given. Letter VIII makes Nero an "admirer" of Paul's Epistles! Then the allusion to Poppaea.

foot's effort to connect Seneca's Corduban birth with "Phoenician influences" in the Spanish Roman province of Baetica. The *Annaei*, who were of Equestrian rank, had come into the *colonia* from Italy. As soon interpret "Celtiberian influences" into the Spanish Roman Quintilian of Calagurris. The aim of the present study is not to tread in anyone's footsteps. It is, to elucidate the *ingenium* of the two men, bringing to bear the facts of their own careers, of their vision and spiritual foundations. Thus, I believe, the chasm, unbridgeable between philosophical essays and the fundamentals of Christian faith, will appear deeper than ever. And as elsewhere and before, I must avoid generalizations and academic paragraphs,³ and limit myself, as I prefer, to concrete matters and concrete utterances. There is also an excellent monograph in Volume IV of the Dictionary of Christian Biography, by J. Bass Mullinger, of St. John's, Cambridge,⁴ a study superior, I venture to say, to Rossbach's article in Pauly-Wissowa, *s. v.* Annaeus.⁵ May I venture here to refer to chapter II of my *From Augustus to Augustine*, and to chapter XVIII of my *Testimonium Animae*.⁶

More and more, under the *Pax Romana*, had Rome come to be the metropolis of the Mediterranean world. In the times of Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, and Nero its prizes and great careers more and more drew on the provinces. Thus L. Annaeus Seneca, the Spanish-Roman, became the successor, as the foremost orator, to

³ Such are spread in Zeller's *Philosophie der Griechen* III, 1, 3rd ed., 1880, pp. 693-729. In the most famous (and the most important) of Seneca's works, the *Epistulae Morales* of the last years of his life, Seneca produces a series of brilliant essays, often little sermons, using as his text some utterances of a Greek he had just been reading in his library, frequently from Epicurus.

⁴ London, Murray, 1887.

⁵ Cambridge University Press, 1923.

⁶ New York: G. E. Stechert & Co., 1908.

Domitius Afer, the Roman Gaul. Spaniard-Romans, like Gallio, held foremost rank in the rhetor's profession on the Tiber. It was he who adopted Seneca's brother, Novatus, who as proconsul of Achaia, at Corinth, figures in Paul's missionary career (Acts 18:12) about 52 A.D. Seneca himself had been recalled from his exile in Corsica⁷ in 49 A.D. through Agrippina the niece and last wife of the uxorious Claudius. At Rome Seneca soon attained an enormous power in every direction, and a wealth which, under Nero, seems to have risen to the enormous total of not less than thirteen millions in our standard. So we read in Tacitus,⁸ while the later historian Cassius Dio⁹ says that the native rising of the Britanni under Queen Budicca was partly due to the fact that Seneca suddenly called in the large loans which he had outstanding in that province. In Egypt too he had large investments, as he himself intimates (*quis illic [i.e., in Alexandria] esset rerum mearum status.—Ep. 77, 3*). Now we must firmly hold to the clamant dissonance between the beautiful and inspiring moral epigrams and the actual career of the author, philosopher, and statesman. We know that power is sweet and wealth sought by most men, then and now. The life and social eminence and wealth of Nero's minister of state certainly contains nothing which would remind us of St. Paul (1 Tim. 6:10), "For the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil: which some reaching after have been led astray from the faith," and still Seneca wrote in Corsica, *Avaritia, gravissima generis humani pestis (Ad Helviam Matrem 3, 2)*.

Further, Seneca, feeling his intellectual prominence

⁷ On this exile, cf. the doctoral dissertation, in New York University, 1922, by Eli E. Burriss.

⁸ *Annales* 13, 42.

⁹ Epitome of b. 62, c. 61.

among his contemporaries at the capital, never, as a true Stoic, displays a trace of humility or sincere modesty. Thus, when referring to his relegation to Corsica in 41 A.D. and surveying his own career up to that time, he wrote in his last years:

I devoted myself to liberal pursuits. Although a lack of means urged a different course in a direction where there is a direct material reward for appreciation [the rhetor's profession], I turned aside to poetry [his Tragedies] which is done without compensation, and betook myself to the wholesome study of philosophy. I showed that excellence may come to any soul, and struggling out of the narrow limits of my position at birth, measuring myself not by my social lot but by my own spirit, I gained a position as a peer to the greatest men. [*Naturales Quaestiones* IV, *Praefatio* 14.]

But how does Paul of Tarsus survey his own life? "His physical presence was weak and his delivery contemptible," said some of his missionary rivals, false apostles it seems, in the new Christian communion (2 Cor. 10:10). Here we may add those glowing and imperishable words:

Are they ministers of Christ? I speak as one beside myself [*παράφρονων*], I more; in labors more abundantly, in prisons more abundantly [as at Philippi, Acts 16], in stripes above measure, in deaths [*i.e.*, close dangers of death] oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes less one. Thrice was I beaten with rods [Roman punishment as by the lictors at Philippi, a Roman colony], once was I stoned [through the instigation of the Jews at Antioch and Iconium, Acts 14:19], thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of rivers, in perils of robbers, in perils from my own countrymen¹⁰ in perils from the Gentiles¹¹

¹⁰ *I.e.*, those of "my own race," Jews. For, although Paul had the *civitas Romana* from birth, the racial consciousness outweighed it always. The social and religious privileges of the Jews in the Roman Empire were firmly established from Caesar's time onward, as I showed from Josephus, in a former article of my present series (The Older Diaspora, Oct., 1925).

¹¹ The Jews called all non-Jews with the collective term nations (*ἔθνη*). Jerome translates here *gentes*, a term of racial consciousness rather than of religion, although in that theocratic state race and religion were fairly coterminous.

in perils in the wilderness,¹² in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; in labour and travail,¹³ in watchings often [sleeplessness], in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness [bareness]. [2 Cor. 11:23-27.]

"I fought with the wild beasts at Ephesus" (1 Cor. 15:32), this probably in a metaphorical sense, referring to his Jewish adversaries in that great metropolis of the province of Asia.

As Paul there refers to Epicureanism and quotes a *monostichos* of Menander (1 Cor. 15:33), and further, at Athens, on the Areopagus he had, with felicitous aptness, cited a line from Kleanthes or Aratos, and, in his pastoral monition to Titus (1:12) working among the Cretans, had quoted a current hexameter from the Cretan Epimenides with a note of his own—a "prophet" (sage) of the Cretans themselves—we would much like to know what Greek cultural influences came to him in his native city of Tarsus. This city, indeed, ranked close to Alexandria and Athens, as Strabo tells us (673): "And so great a devotion for the people there has come to be as regards philosophy and the rest of regular education that they [the Tarsians] have outdone both Athens and Alexandria [where the greatest libraries were; we think of the culture of Philo Iudaeus], and if any other place can be named, in which schools and pursuits of philosophers have come to be. And it [Tarsus] differs [from Athens and Alexandria] to the extent, that here the students are all natives, and strangers do not reside there readily."

Did young Saul attend the school of one of the many *grammatikoi* in Tarsus in his boyhood, or did he get his Greek from life, from the town, from the LXX? For

¹² Better in solitude (*ἐν ἐρημίᾳ*), far from the madding crowd, not necessarily "in the desert."

¹³ "Toil and trouble," we would say now.

there is the greatest probability that domestic familiarity with these scrolls not less than in the synagogue figured in the earlier stage of his life before he took up rabbinism at Jerusalem. Of his direct missionary contact with cultivated Greeks, apart from his brief sojourn at Athens, we know little. He had pleasant social relations with some Asiarchs in Ephesus (Acts 19:31), men of the very first social order in the Greek East. Were his hearings in Rome conducted in Greek?

The most impressive utterance of the Apostle dealing with his missionary sufferings must not be omitted in this connection, "for I bear, branded on my body the marks of Jesus" (the *stigmata*, certainly not as in the ecstatic visions of a noted medieval founder of a certain monastic order.—Gal. 6:17); exegetes differ widely. I venture to suggest that the physical sufferings and outrages endured by St. Paul had, probably, left scars on his body which were enduring.

But let us return to Seneca. When he was in exile at Corsica, he compared himself to Prometheus pinned to the rock.¹⁴ Also, from his exile, wrote a work of abject flattery dedicated to Polybius. Polybius was a freedman and the literary private secretary of the Emperor Claudius, who in 41 A.D. had found Seneca guilty of illicit relations with the Princess Julia. We dissent from that verdict, forced as it was on the uxorious Claudius by his Empress, the unspeakable Messalina. The exiled Stoic with worldly shrewdness hopes to reach the Emperor himself. Among other things Seneca appeals to Fortuna: "Suffer him [Claudius] to heal the human race now for a long time suffering

¹⁴ Addressing Corduba:

Ille tuus quondam magnus, tua gloria, civis
Infigar scopulo (*Epigrammata super Exilio ad Cordubam*).

and ailing. Suffer him to replace and restore whatever the madness of his imperial predecessor [Caligula] has shaken. May this star, which has gleamed once more for the world hurled into the abyss and sunk into night—may it shine forever.” And it was the same Seneca who, after the sudden death of the semi-imbecile and gullible Claudius, as though in scornful triumph, wrote his Trifle on the Death of Claudius (*Ludus de Morte Claudii*). The wretched Emperor was speeded into death by a poisoned mushroom (*coletus medicatus*, Suetonius), Nero (b. 37 A.D.) then but seventeen. Poor Claudius was duly *inter deos relatus* by the constitutional authority of deification, the Roman Senate.

The hatred and contempt for Claudius, which Seneca had nursed for many years, was great and intense; still his own facile pen was ever at the service of his pupil Nero. Nero's very first utterance to the chief bulwark of the *principate*, the Praetorians, had been composed by Seneca, probably some little time before Claudius breathed his last.¹⁵ And when finally the wretched Nero, impatient of his mother's tutelage and urged on by his mistress Poppaea, sought for her the imperial diadem¹⁶ in 59 A.D. and had his own mother foully murdered by his freedman Aniketos, who composed the public plea for the imperial matricide? Seneca. His thesis was this: The Emperor had been compelled, for self-preservation, to anticipate and so to frustrate a conspiracy against himself, designed by his own mother, Agrippina.¹⁷ The state paper addressed to the Senate by Nero was composed by Seneca whose

¹⁵ *Cassius Dio* 61, 3.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* 61, 12. Dio's credibility elsewhere suffers from reckless imputation of motive.

¹⁷ Tacitus: *Annals* XIV, 11.

public reputation duly suffered,¹⁸ although his wealth grew. In the earlier and better years of Nero, Burrus, prefect of the Praetorians was associated with the philosopher; these two in a measure constituted the government. It was Burrus who held this great post when Paul in the spring of 61 A.D. arrived from Malta, Syracuse, and Puteoli, by the Via Appia, in Rome.

Both Seneca and Paul have written of the decadence of their times. But the missionary of Christ limited himself to general and more or less universal features of that highly civilized paganism, as in Romans 1, where indeed he specified some of the basest and foulest aspects of the actual world, and his survey is sweeping in its condemnation (as Rom. 6:19), "for as ye presented your members as servants to uncleanness and to iniquity," etc., or when he adverts to the former moral condition of the Ephesians in their pagan state. Then the Apostle somehow blends the natural man (Jew or pagan) and the unconverted pagan (Eph. 2:3 *sqq.*) or again (Eph. 4:17 *sqq.*): "I entreat¹⁹ you in the Lord [better, by the Lord] that ye [by a closer translation] no longer conduct yourselves as do the nations"; and especially (v. 19) "But ye have not so learned Christ." And we may freely infer that Paul's moral exhortation attached itself, not indeed to any ethical theories, basic or otherwise, even the Ten Commandments, but to the actual life and example of Him whose commission he claimed to hold, which eventually he sealed with his witnesship or martyrdom on the Via Ostiensis. A life and model greater even than the Beatitudes which once fell from His blessed lips. As to

¹⁸ Tacitus: *loc. cit.* Ergo non iam Nero, cuius immanitas omnium questus anteibat, sed Seneca adverso rumore erat, quod oratione tali confessionem scripsisset. *Ad Quintilian* VIII, 5, 18.

¹⁹ *Μαρτύρομαι*. It is a monition approaching the earnestness of an oath.

the Augustan, the pre-Neronian Rome, I will not stain this page even by the name of a rich Roman who practiced vices quoted about town and described in detail by the Stoic Seneca.

Did Seneca ever consider himself a missionary destined to bring about a regeneration of the Roman society of his day? That society would have uttered guffaws when considering the example and the daily life of the Stoic's quondam pupil, Nero, expert lyric singer, charioteer, slayer of his adoptive brother Britannicus, his legal spouse Octavia, his own mother who bore him.²⁰ I find myself in close agreement with the British scholar, R. D. Hicks, in the *Britannicus* (11th ed.): "To judge him as a Stoic philosopher by the counsels of perfection laid down in his writings would be much the same thing as to apply the standards of New Testament morality to the career of a Wolsey or a Mazarin."

But let us now turn to some concrete data of Roman society which we may well accept more readily from the pen of Seneca than the rhetorical preachments of Juvenal or the brutalities of Martial. That world positively rejoiced in such mirroring of itself—not to speak of Nero's own courtier and *Magister Elegantiarum*, Petronius Arbiter (on whose function and final end see Tacitus: *Annals* 16, 18-19). But let us look a little more closely at the Rome of Seneca and St. Paul. "They do not look forward to moral faults as a simple point, but nimble and in mutual conflict they are in uproar: they rout in turn and are routed, but the same

²⁰ And still the courtier, although then an ex-courtier, Seneca, in the last years of his life, thus refers to the imperial monster: Centuriones duos, quos Nero Caesar, ut aliarum virtutum, ita veritatis amantissimus ad investigandum Caput Nili miserat [*Nat. Quaest.* VI, 8, 31]. We must, however, in all fairness, not forget that Seneca had a wider reading public than any author of his day.

judgment we will have to utter about ourselves, viz., that evil we are, evil we have been, and unwillingly I will add—evil we shall be” (*De Beneficiis* I, 10, 3). “Is there any shame left for adultery, since we have reached the point that no woman has a husband but to allure a paramour? Chastity is a proof of ugliness” (*ibid.* III, 16, 3). Masters have the power of life and death over their slaves. Exposure of infants is permitted to fathers. The shamelessness of Julia, only child of Augustus, is recalled with forbidding detail.²¹ “I see silken garments, if they are to be called garments in which there is nothing by which the body or decency can be covered, in assuming which [garments] the woman will not fairly swear that she is not nude” (*ibid.* VII, 9, 5). By contrast we read in Paul: “In like manner, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefastness and sobriety [*σωφροσύνη*]; not with braided hair, and gold” (1 Tim. 2:9). The great artists in poisoning, whose skill cannot be uncovered except by death.²² “Luxury ever devises something novel to direct its madness to it. . . . We [men] assume the face-paint of courtesans which not even matrons must put on.” Further the unspeakable practices connected with the *exoleti*, or lust slaves.²³ The influence of Roman spectacles: “I return more covetous, more of an office-seeker, more luxury-loving, nay more cruel and inhuman, because I have been among human beings” (*Ep. Mor.* 7, 3). At gladiatorial and wild beast shows: “Early in the morning human beings are exposed to lions and to bears, at noon they are pitted against their own spectators. They [the public] bid slayers to be pitted against future slayers and preserve

²¹ *Ibid.* III, 23, 3; III, 31, 3; VI, 12, 1.

²² *Nat. Quaest.* III, 5.

²³ *Ibid.* VII, 31, 3; cf. Rom. 1.

the victor for another act of slaying; the passing out of the combatants is death." (*Ibid.* 7, 4.) In temples: "The most shameless vows they whisper to the gods; if anyone should listen closely, they are hushed. What they want no human being to know, they tell to a god." (*Ibid.* 10, 5.) Torture of slaves, instruments of torture for each limb, some to gash as with a butcher's cleaver, their groans and shouts of agony under torture. Pantomimic actors are rated so highly that youths of the most aristocratic families make themselves the slaves of these stage folk.²⁴ The life of the rich on the gulf of Naples, at Baiae (Seneca had a villa near by): "To see tipsy persons wandering along the beaches, and wild carousings of those sailing, and the lakes resounding with the music of orchestras, and other things, which luxury, emancipated from laws, not only commits, but brazenly vaunts" (*ibid.* 51, 4). The actual ideals and pursuits of men: "This one comes from banquets and luxury, that one from electoral pursuits, a crowd of clients clustering about him, the other comes from his mistress, another from a vain daily display of liberal learning and vain pursuits that do not make him whole" (*ibid.* 59, 15). Wares of costly luxury, some weighed with gold, landed at the port of Puteoli. Tables of the rich, wine cooled with snow or broken ice, oysters from the Lucrinian lake, noisy display, carrying in dishes in portable ovens, the very kitchen displayed in the dining room. Towering sepulchral monuments (as on the Appian Way) while the ashes after cremation equalized all. Physical decadence due to luxury of the table. The *exoleti* in the slave markets and their awful lot. Women aping men in vicious manner.²⁵

²⁴ *Ep. Mor.*, 24, 14; 47, 17.

²⁵ *Ibid.* 73, 5; 78, 23; 91, 16; 95, 16; 95, 24; 95, 20.

Clearly we see then that the coming of Christianity was not all an evolution out of a fancied and advanced stage of paganism, but the greatest revolution recorded in human annals. We now quote, by contrast with this Roman world, an utterance of the great missionary which he wrote at Rome at about the same time that Seneca penned his *Epistulae Morales*, i.e., in 62 A.D.: "And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather even reprove them; for the things which are done by them in secret, it is a shame even to speak of" (5:11-12). Or: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself up for it; having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word, so that he might present the church to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing" (Eph. 5:25 *sqq.*). There was indeed a deep chasm between "those without" (1 Tim. 3:7) and the Messiah believers, or Christians, first called so at Antioch on the Orontes (Acts 11:26). And the term "saints" (*ἅγιοι*), freely designating the members, was indeed a very real and exacting and discriminating term; it was a stern, actual, living postulate. We may add here "the appetites of the world" (Tit. 2:12). And this world, the *kosmos*,²⁶ with the Apostle is not merely "the ungodly multitude, the whole mass of men alienated from God, and therefore hostile to the cause of Christ"; it included (and still includes) the philosophers to whom the cross of Christ is, in the main, foolishness.

Academic assent, let alone whole-hearted acceptance—sometimes in a partial and somewhat condescending manner—comes but rarely, and I do not wonder. Personally I take neither that assent nor dissent seri-

²⁶ See Grimm-Thayer Lexicon, s. v. *κόσμος*, 6.

ously. The Stoic (in Seneca, *e.g.*) is absolutely self-centered, self-determined, absolutely sovereign in analyzing his soul, or the universe, the dialectic operations of the arguing mind often challenging gods and men. For in pantheism men, especially the academic efflorescence of our kind, are the apex of things and modestly place a halo around their own heads.

At the same time I must, in all fairness, present some outstanding features of Seneca's *Weltanschauung*. The ideal "sage" is a wonderful being, rarely found in the flesh (Socrates came nearer to that perfection, according to the Stoic school, than any other man). Him no wrong or contumely can touch. His mortality apart, he is the peer of God, "striving and consistently aiming at those things which are lofty, well ordered, fearless, moving on in an equable and harmonious current, free from any apprehension, kindly, born for the public good, wholesome to himself and to others, he will crave nothing base, he will weep at nothing, [being one] who, resting on reason, will stride through the vicissitudes of human life with a godlike spirit" (*Dialogi* II, 8, 2). He holds nothing superior to himself, let alone pleasure.²⁷ His soul is impregnable to any evil or injury, since he excises all emotions in his quest of imperturbability (*ἀταραξία*), the *summum bonum* of the school. Nothing and nobody can force his will or resolution. You may exile him to the uttermost parts of the world, in any nook of barbarism; he will be at home there. His commonwealth is the universe. He is never less alone than when he is alone.

Further: The sage and the "gods." Reason is that which gods and men have in common; in the first named

²⁷ *Ibid.* VII, 11, 1.

it has reached a stage of perfection, in us it is perfectible. In what does Jupiter outrank a good man? His goodness endures longer, but the sage rates himself no lower in that his virtues are limited by a narrower space; god does not outdo the sage in felicity, although he does outdo him in age.²⁸

But what, after all, in Seneca's Stoicism is "God"? Thus he wrote to his mother Helvia from his Corsican exile:

This was accomplished, believe me, whoever was he that moulded the universe [*formator universi*], whether he is that god powerful over all, or immaterial reason, craftsman of the huge works, or a divine spirit permeating everything, greatest and smallest with equal force, or fate and the immutable sequence of mutually connected causes [*Ad Helviam Matrem*.—8, 3].

Elsewhere:

For what is nature but God and the divine reason injected into the whole world and its parts? Him likewise if you will identify with fate, you will not lie, for inasmuch as fate is nothing else but the intertwined series of causes, he is the first cause of all, from whom the others are dependent. [*De Benef.* V, 7, 1-2.]

After explaining Bacchus, Hercules, Mercury in that Stoic theology of personified nature forces, he continues:

Therefore you accomplish nothing, most ungrateful of mortals, who deniest that you owe to God, but to "nature," because neither is nature without God, nor God without nature; they are both the same, but differ in function. If what you have received from Seneca you said you owed to Annaeus or to Lucius, you would not change your creditor, but the name only, since whether you had uttered *prænomen* or *nomen* or *cognomen*, he would be the same nevertheless; so now call Nature, Fate, Fortune; they are all names of the same divinity using his power variously. [*Ibid.* 1, 8, 2-3.]

²⁸ *Ep. Mor.* 28, 4; 92, 27; 73, 13.

Now, whether we call this pantheism or deism or something else, clearly such analysis could not well be turned into worship, or any trust in life and death. How nebulous and vaporous is all this when we turn to St. Paul's faith and trust, revealed through and resting upon the Christ, Son of God, Redeemer of a sinful world, through whom we have an approach (προσαγωγή, Eph. 2:18; 3:12) to the living God. All through Paul's wonderful mission, from Damascus onward, in the last year of Tiberius or so, 37 A.D., to the end on the Ostian Road, he was sustained in his apostolate by the Spirit of Christ, and by the belief that "the head of Christ is God" (1 Cor. 11:3). "Through the grace of God I am what I am, and his grace which was bestowed upon me was not found vain; but I labored more abundantly than they all: yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me" (1 Cor. 15:10). The fanatical Pharisee who eagerly consented to the stoning of the protomartyr, and who, after traversing many provinces proclaiming the "mystery" of the Gospel, *i.e.*, the history, the wonderful *res-gestae*, of Jesus the Messiah, finally stood before Nero, as he had stood before the philosophers at Athens and before Felix and Festus and Herod Agrippa, and the power, we hold, that sustained the Cilician tentmaker was no subjective enthusiasm; it was the Spirit of the living God. It was the same that dictated to him that anthem of eternity, 1 Corinthians 13, the eternal supremacy of love, spiritual love, compared with which the tenets of self-centered Stoicism are as blocks of hard, cold granite, as against the rays of the sun calling into life the seeds in spring time and unfolding the buds in copse and forest.

I have great pleasure in transcribing at this point

from the latest book on St. Paul, Dr. Foakes-Jackson's *The Life of St. Paul, the Man and the Apostle*:²⁹

But if no more is assumed than the common modern claim, that Jesus was no more than an unique personality, Who, after a brief mission in Galilee, during which He declared many beautiful truths, was crucified by the enmity of the Jews; was not His simple life overshadowed by the stupendous labours of a disciple who had probably never so much as seen HIM? But the voice of centuries of history and human experience plainly denies this. Christianity never has been, nor can be, what is usually called Paulinism, for all the attractive features of the system; and even though at times the teaching of Paul has been studied to the exclusion of most of the rest of the New Testament, its influence in many centuries of the Church's life has been but intermittent. But at no time has it been possible to ignore Jesus, even by those who deny Him the obedience which His church demands, and refuse to see in Him the Saviour of the World. Christianity stands or falls with Jesus. It is profoundly untrue to say that Paul made Jesus, or even gave Him an importance He would not otherwise have had. It is a literal fact that Jesus made Paul, and the greatness of the disciple is one of the chief miracles wrought by the Master. [P. 280 f.]

And while the Spirit of the Master had sanctified the great Apostle, still we may even now observe the personal *ingenium* of Paul in some passages of his extant letters, *e.g.*, the fearless and absolute energy which shrinks not from an oath or an oath-like asseveration or appeal. Thus: "But though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema" (accursed) (Gal. 1:8). Or: "If any one does not love the Lord, let him be anathema" (2 Cor. 16:22). Or:

²⁹ Boni & Liveright, New York, 1926, pp. 280 f. I am now convinced that the story of Jesus from Bethlehem to ascension was the chief theme of Paul's missionary sermons or heraldings—eventually Luke's Gospel, if we may trust Eusebius: *H. E.* III, 4, 6, 7, who alludes to Rom. 2:16 and 2 Tim. 2:8, hence I fail to see the point which Dr. Foakes-Jackson makes when he says, on p. 243, "It is remarkable how few allusions there are in the Epistles to the ministry or even to the character of Christ."

"God and the Father of the Lord Jesus, he who is blessed for evermore, knoweth that I lie not" (2 Cor. 11:31).

Over against the cosmopolitanism and humanism of the Stoics never issuing into any practical results, do we find a practical universality in Paul's labors, as, *e.g.*, in the case of the slave Onesimus who had run away from his master Philemon at Colossae,³⁰ the slave who had been born into a new life as a Christian convert by the imprisoned Paul at Rome and had become a brother in Christ to his former master, but still, as a slave in the civil order, is sent back with that exquisite note now incorporated in the canon of the New Testament, saying, "If he has wronged you in anything or owes anything, charge it to me: I, Paul have written with my own hand, I shall pay it." Paul spread abroad a sweeping humanity in his mission—"Where there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freedman, but Christ is all, and in all" (Col. 3:11), likewise written from Rome.

Few themes are there in Seneca's essays to which he returns as often as that of death. His sect indeed classed the King of Terrors with the *adiaphora*, *fortuita* or *media*, neither a boon nor any evil. And besides, as a consistent Stoic, Roman Stoic admirer of Cato of Utica, he often extols suicide.

No man is wretched except through his own fault. You are satisfied? Very well, go on living. You are not satisfied? It is in your power to return whence you came. Often you have had a blood-letting to relieve a headache. A vein is cut

³⁰ On the harrowing cruelty of the Romans towards peasant slaves cf. Seneca: *Ep. Mor.* 14, 5: Cogita hoc loco carcerem et cruces et eculeos [the wooden horse with sharp metal points] et uncum et adactum per medium hominem, qui per os emergeret, stipitem, et distracta in diversum actis curribus membra, illam tunicam alimentis ignium et inlitam et textam, et quicquid aliud praeter haec commenta saevitia est. Add *De Ira* III, 3, 6.

to relieve your body. There is no need of cleaving the diaphragm with a great wound; the way to the great freedom is opened with a scalpel, and your emancipation from care costs but a puncture. [*Ep. Mor.* 70, 16.]

From Cato of Utica onward Seneca often contemplated a series of Romans who escaped from tyrants by self-destruction and thus wrought a freedom denied them in their lives.

Whithersoever you gaze, there is an end of your troubles. Do you see that precipice? There is a descent to freedom. Do you see that sea, that river, that cistern? Freedom sits at the bottom. Do you see that small tree, shrivelled, good for nothing? Freedom is suspended from it. Do you see your neck, your throat, your heart? They are avenues of escape from slavery. [*De Ira* III, 15, 4.]

There are also found strains of affinity with Plato's flights, as in the *Timaeus*. Seneca's reading was wide; his entire personality a microcosm of Greco-Roman civilization. He was never quite sure whether death was an end or a transit to something else. He frankly admits that the greatest element of unrest for most men was the anticipation of death, while the only real blessing of life, which the Stoics called *ataraxia*, imperturbability, was ever impugned or called in question by life itself. It was all very well to define the good as identical with moral good (virtue in our sense). Men admitted that readily in theory but denied it in life.

One man is sad because he has lost his children, another, because they are ailing, another is grieved because they are base and have incurred some infamy or other. That man you will see tortured by love for another's wife, still another by love for his own wife. There will not be lacking the man who has been defeated at the polls. There will be those who are kept in unrest by the office of state which they hold. But the greatest indeed is that crowd of wretched men, in all the congregation of mortals, who are kept in unrest by the expectation of death impending from every source. For there is noth-

ing out of which it may not surprise us. Hence, as though sojourning in a hostile country, one must glance about hither and thither and turn one's neck at every noise; unless this fear is cast from the breast, one lives with a palpitating heart. [*Ep. Mor.* 74, 3-4.]

One is reminded here of Hebrews 2:15³¹: "and might deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage."

Seneca had gotten wealth, power, and fame, all three in a measure in which probably not one of his contemporaries in the Mediterranean world could claim parity, and still he ever preached different ideals. The Seneca of public life, the courtier, statesman, capitalist, and investor, is the one; the quiet author and the satirist in the library, is the other, as if two different souls had dwelt in one body. The learning and taste as brought into culture from Homer to Virgil, or from Thales to Seneca, were his. His sympathies and antipathies, the brilliant epigrams of his favorite vein of satire and condemnation, are before us.

The Academic School, Anarcharsis the Scythian visitor at Athens, Anaxagoras, Antisthenes the Cynic, Aristippus the Hedonist, Ariston the Stoic, Chrysippus the Stoic, Cicero, Democritus, Empedocles, Epicurus, Fabianus and Sotion his own teachers, Heraclitus, Lucretius the Roman translator of Epicurus, Metrodorus, Novatus-Gallio his own brother, Panaetius, Plato, Parmenides, Posidonius, Pythagoras, the Sextii, Socrates chief saint in his private cult, Varro *doctissimus Romanorum*, Virgil then the most quotable of Roman poets, Xenocrates, Xenophon, and his own Zeno founder of the Stoic sect—all these and more pass by

³¹ The authorship of this great Epistle—Paul's or merely Paulinian—is one of those matters in N. T. philology of which one may well say: *Adhuc sub iudice lis est*

s in his pages, mostly Greeks. And it was of the Greeks that Paul spoke, collectively, when he wrote these sweeping and fundamental words: "For seeing that in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom knew not God, it was God's good pleasure through the foolishness of the preaching [*i.e.*, the subject of the preaching] to save them that believe. Seeing that Jews seek for signs and the Greeks seek after wisdom: but we preach Christ crucified, unto Jews a stumbling block [*skandalon*] unto the Gentiles [*nationes*] foolishness; but unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ, the power of God and the wisdom of God." (1 Cor. 1:21-24.)

Now, all the philosophers, from Thales to Seneca, had utterly failed in several most important things. They had not cleaned or abolished the popular religions and their radical, often grossly immoral, forms of cult; they had not brought about any purification of life; they had submitted themselves to the autocrats of Antioch and Alexandria, and, bickering and antagonizing one another in the schools and scholastic controversies, they had cultivated in the main intellectual and academic pride, not to speak of the futile minutiae of the *grammatici* sarcastically touched upon repeatedly by Seneca himself, especially in *Epistulae Morales* 88. A genuine peace of soul, I believe, is unattainable by human ethics, least of all in the modern zoölogical pretended *Weltanschauung*, or any other exudation of thought.

The *ataraxia* of the Stoics was, necessarily, something negative, man-made, whereas the absolute dependency of actual human nature seeks and needs something not man-made, a revelation, such as the unparalleled incarnation, life, and obedience of Jesus, His

atoning suffering, and the glorious eternity offered us. Seneca's brilliancy, the sententiousness of his epigrammatic and brilliant style, became the mode in Rome where, after the Stoic's death and after the passing of the unspeakable Nero, Quintilian vainly strove to rehabilitate Ciceronian standards.³² We cannot see that Seneca accomplished or seriously expected to accomplish any moral reformation in the society all around him; he rather reminds one of the modern student who brings his retort or his microscope to bear on the elements of a body approaching cadaverous dissolution.

How widely different is the fervor of the great missionary bent on carrying the Gospel to Illyricum, and further to Rome, nay to Spain, equally eager to bring it to the humble, the slaves, but equally fearless to proclaim it and to confess the name of Jesus before the *synedrium* of Jerusalem, before the philosophers of Athens, nay before Caesar, the Princeps Nero on the Palatine, or in the Praetorium³³ on the northeast side of the capital of the Mediterranean world. The treasure he spread abroad was not indeed his own; he was but the dispensing steward, the *oikonomos*, and this deputyship inspired him, as when he wrote, "Let a man account us ministers [better, servants] and stewards of the mysteries of God" (1 Cor. 4:1). And whenever a door was opened he was eager to carry the Gospel, as in Acts 14:27, God "had opened the door of faith to the nations." Compare 2 Corinthians 2:12, or Colossians 4:3, "that God might open for us a door of the word,

³² Quod accidit mihi, dum corruptum et omnibus vitiis fractum dicere genus revocare ad severiora iudicia contendo. Tum autem solus hic felix in manibus adolescentium fuit. [*Instit. Orator.* X, 1, 125 sqq.] Seneca placebat propter sola vitia [*ibid.* 127].

³³ A curious illustration of the safekeeping of a prisoner of state do we find in Seneca (*Ep. Mor.* 5, 7): Quemadmodum eadem catena et custodia et militem copulat. Cf. Acts 28:16.

peak the mystery of Christ on account which also I am prisoner."

The life about him often suggests to Paul images or metaphors for his own pen. The athletic games and the athletes themselves, their training and their prizes, often appear in his letters. Thus wrestling (πάλη): "For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood [as at the games periodically recurring at Ephesus, held under the presidency of the "Asiarchs"]" (Eph. 6:12.) We may here quote Seneca:

As for the athletes, how many blows do they meet with their face, how many with their whole body. Still they endure every cruel pain in their craving for fame, and not only do they endure these things because they contend, but in order that they may contend. Training itself is a grueling hardship; let us too overcome all things, whose reward is not a wreath or a palm branch, or a trumpeter who proclaims silence for the public announcements of our name. [*Ep. Mor.* 78, 16.]

At once we turn with Paul to the Isthmian games at Corinth: "Know ye not that they who run in a stadium [A.V. "in a race"] run all, but one [only] receiveth the prize? Even so run that you may attain [it]." (1 Cor. 9:24.) I beg to present the rest in a looser version: "And everyone who enters himself for an athletic contest, maintains severe self-control in every way [food, wine, abstinence from illicit indulgence. Cf. Grimm-Thayer *s.v.*] They, that they may gain a perishable wreath, but we an imperishable one. [then so run as not vaguely [*ἀδῆλως*, *i.e.*, without definite aim]. So do I box as not hitting the air, but I bruise [ἐπιποιδίζω] my own body and enslave it, lest somehow or rather having preached to others I may become myself one who has failed in the test." (1 Cor. 9:25-27.)

And so from his Roman prison to his beloved Philippians, "forgetting the things which are behind, and

stretching forward [*i.e.*, letting out all my strength to the uttermost as a runner must—ἐπεκτεινόμενος] to the things that are before, I press on to the goal unto the prize" (Phil. 3:13-14). And he calls the Philippian "my joy and my wreath" (Phil. 4:1. Similarly 1 Tim. 6:12). And so, near the closing of his mission work and clearly facing a martyr's death in Rome, he wrote to his beloved pupil (probably in the summer of 66 A.D. according to Dr. Zahn's computation): "For I am already being offered up [as in a libation] and the time of my departure is come. I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course [the foot race], I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me the crown [wreath] of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous judge, will give to me on that day." (2 Tim. 4:6-8.)

In still another way does Paul reflect the time with his pen; I mean the borrowing of terms from the Roman law. Thus we have *tutela*, *curatela*, *adoptio* (Gal. 4: *sqq.*; cf. Eph. 1:5; Rom. 8:15). The Christian slave is a *libertus* (ἀπελεύθερος) of God (1 Cor. 7:22). *Civitas* (πολίτευμα) (Phil. 3:20; cf. Heb. 13:14); *depositum* in the civil law of Rome (παραθήκη) (1 Tim. 6:20; 2 Tim. 12:14).

Of Paul's manner of preaching our best illustrations occurred in Antioch in Pisidia (Galatia in Sir Wm Ramsay's computation. Acts 13:16 *sqq.*), greatly condensed of course in Luke's report. Again, his farewell on the strand at Miletus, valedictory to the elders of Ephesus (Acts 20:18 *sqq.*), determined as he was, amid the lowering clouds threatening his freedom and his life to finish his course (v. 24); and the spiritual power permeating it has not been weakened or become stale by the passing of many centuries. Should we honor him

ss, even now, than the elders who covered his venerable
 unenance with kisses (κατεφιλον, v. 38).

In the slender glimpses afforded us of the primitive
 church and its services a few things are clear. There
 must have figured largely the prophetic things in Isaiah
 and elsewhere in the canons of the older dispensation,
 interpreted as bearing on the Son of Man, the Messiah
 destined not for Israel alone, but for all the world. We
 ask ourselves: What was the "reading" in the service at
 Ephesus which Timothy was to maintain consistently?
 Was it chiefly or exclusively selections from the Sep-
 tuagint? But we cannot but infer a very positive dif-
 ferentiation from the synagogues, which, particularly
 at Ephesus, had been closed forever to the Gospel of
 Christ. I refer here to Paul's pastoral monition from
 Rome, in his first captivity: "Until I come [once
 more] devote yourself closely [πρόσεχε] to reading, to ex-
 hortation, to teaching" (1 Tim. 4:13). What reading?
 Now what could be more urgent, more important than
 the history of Jesus, the Christ? It is set down by
 Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* III, 4, 7) that Paul
 meant the Gospel of Luke when he used the phrase
 "my gospel" (Rom. 2:16; 2 Tim. 2:8), as Mark's was
 set down as that of Peter—the tremendous facts, I re-
 peat, from Incarnation to Ascension, the essentials of
 the preached Word, as radically differing from all
 myths and all legends and genealogies, beyond all dis-
 tinctions and logomachy (1 Tim. 6:4), and in their
 historical reality differing deeply from the current
 forms of pagan cults in their kaleidoscopic and be-
 wildering variety.

Trustworthy was his account, and in St. Paul's sur-
 vey of the whole, at Rome, this phrase (πιστός ὁ λόγος)
 recurs almost like a refrain (1 Tim. 3:1, 4, 9; 2 Tim.

2:10; Tit. 3:8). Many of the Psalms of the older dispensation, particularly those which were nationalistic were quite unsuitable for the worship of the young "Christian" (or Messianic) church; they were cast into the shade by the history of Christ, and its meaning, not to Israel merely, but to the "nations." I here find myself in pleasant agreement with commentators, such as Dr. Spence (in Ellicott's Collection), on 1 Timothy 3:16. We seem to have before us, in that majestic passage, a Christian hymn, not formed here by Paul for the first time, but referred to as an established form of confession of Christ, condensed, but not essentially different, from the second article of later formulations. Westcott and Hort make six short lines. It is noteworthy how Paul attaches the masculine who (ὃς) to the neuter antecedent, "the great mystery" of our Christian cult or worship (*eusebeia*):

"Who was manifested in the flesh,
Was justified in the Spirit,
Was seen by angels,
Was preached among the nations,
Was believed on in the world,
Was received up³⁴ in glory."

The art of no Handel or Bach would suffice to do justice to this grand and sovereign text. Perhaps was sung in the church in half-choruses.

But, in justice to my general theme and to the honor of Seneca, I will close this monograph with a number of citations of quasi-spiritual import in Seneca, without any regard to, or drawing upon, the excerpts of Dr. Lightfoot, whom to name is to honor. Many of these passages I checked off some twenty years ago when

³⁴ The same term as *analepsis* in St. Paul's Gospel, i. e., Luke 9: (the ascension to come).

working on the last chapter of my *Testimonium animae*.

God has a fatherly spirit toward good men and loves them earnestly [*Dial.* I, 2, 6].

If one will cohabit with his own wife in the belief that she is another man's, he will be an adulterer [*II Dial.* 7, 3].

Man was born for mutual aid, anger for destruction [*De ira* III, 5, 2].

Sextius was wont, when they day was spent, to ask his own soul: "What evil did you heal today? What fault did you resist? At what point are you better?" [*Ibid.* III, 36, 1. Seneca adds that he imitated this habit.]

Conscience must be satisfied; we must not toil for reputation [*loc. cit.* 41, 2].

How great an assistance to men is a good conscience [*De tranquill. Animi* 3, 4].

How to live one must learn all through life, and, what perhaps you will marvel at more, all our life we must learn how to die [*De Brevitate Vitae* 7, 3].

We have all sinned, some severely, others more lightly, some with deliberation, some perhaps impelled and carried away by the wickedness of another [*De Clementia* I, 6, 3].

Driving out the craving for another's possessions, from which arises all the evil of the soul [*ibid.* II, 1, 4].

Sometimes he places us under greater obligations, who gave little, but gladly, who forgot his own poverty while considering mine [*De Beneficiis* I, 7, 1].

Still, we will always have to say the same thing about ourselves: that we *are* evil, that evil we have been, unwittingly I will add, that we shall be so [*ibid.* I, 10, 4].

That is not an act of kindness, but putting out at interest [*genus*], to look around not where you may bestow best, but where you may have most profitably, whence you may recover most easily [*ibid.* IV, 3, 3].

Unless you think perhaps that the gods gain the fruit of their works from the smoke of entrail-offerings, and from the fragrance of incense [*ibid.* IV, 25, 1].

No law could be set for the rain showers about to fall, that they should not descend upon the lands of the evil and wicked [*ibid.* IV, 28, 3].

Let us imitate them [the gods], let us give, even though much has been given in vain [*ibid.* VII, 31, 5].

We shall die more evil than when born; our fault is that not nature's [*Ep. Mor.* 22, 15].

A sacred spirit is lodged within us, the observer of our evil and good actions, a guardian. As this has been treated by us, so it treats us. No good man indeed is without god [*Ibid.* 41, 2].

Do you wonder that men go to the gods? God comes to men, nay, what is nearer, comes into men; no good mind is without god. [*Ibid.* 73, 16.]

While we strive to obtain riches, we fall into many evils; hence riches are not a boon [*ibid.* 87, 28].

We shall prescribe that man shall hold out his hand to a shipwrecked one, to show the way to one who is erring, to divide his bread with him who is hungered [*ibid.* 95, 51].

All men disguise their sins, and although they have turned out luckily, and they enjoy their outcome, the sins themselves they hide [*ibid.* 97, 12].

Let us so shape our soul, as though we had actually reached our end. Let us daily strike our balance with life [*Ibid.* 101, 7].

The day which you dread as the last one, is the birthday of eternity [*ibid.* 102, 26].

The greedy man, the briber, the cruel one, the cheat, are bound to injure you much, if they had been close to you, and within you [*ibid.* 204, 21].

[The deity] is worshiped, not by the slaughtering of the fat bodies of steers, nor by suspending gold and silver gifts [in the temples], nor by pouring collections into the temple treasures, but by pious and upright will [*ibid.* 115, 5].

Fix your mind upon the end of all things, and you will dismiss unessential things [*ibid.* 119, 4].

In conclusion, I cannot resist the temptation to transcribe from a distinguished Paulinian scholar of our own day, Sir William Ramsay, the following valuation: "But Manen, or even Baur, sitting in judgment on Paul, is a mole attempting to estimate the size of a colossus, or the strength of a lion, or the swiftness of an eagle in the air" (*The First Christian Century*, p. 1. Hodder and Stoughton, 1911).

THE APOLOGY OF ARISTIDES

By PARKE P. FLOURNOY

WE have heard from childhood of Aristides the Just, who was sent into exile by the Athenian authorities because this great archon was given this title by his admiring fellow citizens, perhaps with a hint of the inferiority of these authorities. But six hundred years later another Aristides, the Athenian philosopher, did a thing in which we, eighteen centuries later, feel much more interest, and for a very good reason.

In much of our recent literature of various kinds the New Testament is treated in a supercilious, if not even hostile, way. Some have even denied that it was written in the first century, in its entirety. In the spring of 1889, Professor J. Rendel Harris of Clare College, Cambridge, made a discovery which, in its content and influence in leading to other discoveries, has an important bearing upon this matter.¹ Professor Adolf Harnack in his interesting article in the *Prussische Jahrbucher* on this subject says: "The discovery of this *Apology* is a find of the first importance."

The finding of a Syriac translation of the *Apology* of Aristides not only led to the discovery of the four Gospels in Syriac in the Convent of St. Catherine at Mount Sinai, by Mrs. Lewis in 1892, the same place where the *Apology* was found, but strangely enough another copy of this *Apology* was found somewhat later by Professor J. Armitage Robinson of Cambridge University, in the original Greek in which it had been writ-

¹ See The Contemporary Review, November, 1894.

ten, but with some parts missing. In the Ante-Nicene Fathers (Vol. IX, p. 259 ff.) we now find translations into English of both copies of the Apology in parallel columns.

Another defense of the persecuted Christians was presented to the Roman Emperor at the same time with that of Aristides by a much older man, evidently, who had been doing the work of an evangelist many years before this. To see this we may turn to the account of Eusebius, the first historian of the church. In his Ecclesiastical History (Bk. IV, ch. III) we read:

But Trajan² having held the sovereignty for twenty years, wanting six months, is succeeded in the imperial office by Hadrian. To him Quadratus addressed a discourse as an apology [*i.e.*, defense] for the religion we profess, because certain malicious persons attempted to harrass our brethren. The work is still in the hands of some of the brethren as also in our own; from which anyone may see evident proof both of the understanding of the man and of his apostolic faith.

This writer [*i.e.*, Quadratus] shows the antiquity of the age in which he lived in these passages:

"The deeds of our Saviour were always before you, for they were true miracles; those that were healed and those that were raised from the dead, who were seen not only when healed and when raised, but were always present. They remained a long time, not only while our Lord was on earth, but likewise when He had left the earth, so that some of them have also lived to our own times." Such was Quadratus.

Aristides and Quadratus presented their Apologies to Hadrian when he came to Athens to take part in the Eleusinian Mysteries, as Eusebius tells us in his *Chronicon*. "in the eighth year of his reign," *i. e.*, 125 A.D. Hadrian's imperial rescript followed, forbidding the punishment of Christians "without careful investigations and trial." Whether or not this was in consequence of these Apologies we do not know, but cannot help think

² Trajan succeeded Nerva 98 A.D., while the Apostle John was living

ing that it was, if not entirely, yet in great part due to them.³ Let us hear Eusebius again (and if I include some extracts from my book, *New Light on the New Testament*, where the subject is more fully treated, I hope it will be pardoned).

In his *Ecclesiastical History* (Bk. III, ch. xxxvii) Eusebius speaks of Quadratus as "of the first rank of the Apostolic succession," shows that he was a devoted missionary, and, what is of more special interest in our present inquiry, that when he went abroad to preach "to those who had not yet heard the faith," he and his companions "delivered unto them the books of the holy Gospels." After speaking of Quadratus' defense of the Christians he says:

Aristides, also, a man faithfully devoted to the religion we profess, has left to posterity a defense of the faith addressed to Hadrian. This work is also preserved by a great number, even to the present day.

What a flood of light the *Apology of Quadratus* would pour upon this time of triumph, progress, and intense suffering, about which we know so little, if it should be discovered, as that of his fellow apologist has been. We can only hope for this, and turn to the consideration of that of Aristides, the converted Greek philosopher, who is thus spoken of in a medieval martyrology, which gives his Saint's Day as August 31:

The blessed Aristides, most renowned for faith and wisdom, who presented books on the Christian religion to the Prince Hadrian, and most brilliantly proclaimed in the presence of the Emperor himself how Christ Jesus is the only God.

When we come to examine this *Apology* we find it, in large part, an argument against heathenism in vari-

³ Rosse (*Index of Dates*, vol. I, p. 389) says, "[Hadrian] receives from Quadratus and Aristides an apology for Christianity, and sends a letter to Minucius Fundanus which puts a stop to persecution."

ous forms among different races, and a proclamation of the Triune God. Let us hear Aristides on this subject, speaking, as he did, so long before Athanasius:

Now, the Christians trace their origin from the Lord Jesus Christ; and He is acknowledged by the Holy Spirit to be the Son of the Most High God, who came down from Heaven for the salvation of men; being born of a virgin, unbegotten and immaculate, He assumed flesh and revealed Himself among men, that He might recall them to Himself from wandering after many gods, and having accomplished His wonderful dispensation, by a voluntary choice, He tasted death on the cross.

And after three days He came to life again, and ascended into Heaven. And, if you would read, O King, you may judge the glory of His presence from the Holy Gospel writing, as it is called among themselves.

In speaking of the apostles, Aristides tells of one of them who "traversed the countries about us." When we remember that Paul preached in these countries, and look at the short summary (only ten verses) of what he said to the Stoics and Epicureans on Mars Hill, and then turn to this Apology and see what this philosopher, now become a Christian, says about the Christians in whose behalf he was now appealing to the Emperor, it looks very much as if he referred to Paul.

Paul told the philosophers of seeing an altar to "the unknown God," and says, "What, therefore, ye worship in ignorance that set I forth unto you." Likewise Aristides in his Apology earnestly sets forth the doctrine of the true God, unknown to so many at that time, in opposition to the prevailing polytheism, and that in the language of Pauline Trinitarianism, speaking of the three Persons of the Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. His words, speaking of the Christians, are, "For they know God, the Creator and Fashioner of all things through the only-begotten Son and Holy Spirit and beside Him, they worship no other God."

Paul argued against idolatry; so does Aristides.

Paul spoke of God as the Creator "of the world and all things therein"; Aristides begins with the greatest of subjects, the true God, and speaks of Him as "the God of all, who made all things."

Paul asserted to his unbelieving audience the reality of the resurrection; so does Aristides.

Paul spoke of the judgment and of Christ as the Judge; we find Aristides saying, "So shall they appear before the awful judgment, which through Jesus Christ, the Messiah, is to come upon the whole human race."

Paul tells the Athenians of their failure to worship the true God who, he tells them, "is Lord of heaven and earth," and that He "dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is worshipped with men's hands, as if he needed anything, seeing that he giveth to all life and breath and all things." Paul was speaking to philosophers at Athens; the Athenian philosopher Aristides speaking of these philosophers, says: "Herein, too, they err in asserting of Deity that any such thing as deficiency can be present to it, as when they say He receives sacrifice and requires burnt offering and libation and immolations of men, and temples. But God is not in need, and none of these things is necessary to Him."

It appears quite probable that the sketch of Paul's address, in Acts 17, was in the mind of Aristides as he wrote this Apology. That Aristides was familiar with the book of Acts is indicated in another way by the form of two quotations from Acts 15:20, 29. One is the negative form of the Golden Rule. In the Harris Syriac copy, section xv, we find the expression, "and whatsoever they would not that others should do unto them they do not to others." This is noted by Seeberg of Berlin as an instance of "Western corruption of the

text of Acts 15:20." Connected with this we find the statement that "of the food which is consecrated to idols they do not eat." Seeberg concluded that this was in the copy of the Acts used by Aristides, and that it indicates that the Acts was in "ecclesiastical use," and that by the time of Aristides it was "an ancient book, handed down from the Apostolic age." (See Professor Rendel Harris' four lectures on the Western Text.)

But, without the textual criticism of specialists, the ordinary reader can see, in almost every sentence of the part of the Apology in which the character of the Christian community is set forth especially, indubitable indications of the writer's acquaintance with books of the New Testament.

For instance, in Colossians 1:17, we have, "By him all things consist"; Aristides says, "Through him all things consist."

In Romans 1:25, we find the expression, "served the creature rather than the Creator"; Aristides says the heathen "began to worship created things instead of their Creator."

James 3:17, describes Christian "wisdom" as "gentle and easy to be entreated"; Aristides says, Christians "are gentle and easy to be entreated."

In Romans 9:3, we find, "My brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh," and in 8:5, "not after the flesh but after the Spirit"; Aristides has, "Brethren not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."

Peter, speaking of the Epistles of Paul (2 Pet. 3:16), says, "As also in all his epistles . . . in which are some things hard to be understood"; Aristides, having told the Emperor of "the Holy Gospel writing," says, "There are found in their other writings things which are hard to utter and difficult for one to

narrate." (Can we not see here a sign of the genuineness of 2 Peter?)

In Hebrews 2:5; 6:5, we have the words, "the world to come"; Aristides speaks of those who seek "the world to come."

John in Revelation 1:1, speaks of "the things which must come to pass hereafter," and in 1:19 of receiving the command from the Lord, "Write . . . the things which shall come to pass hereafter"; Aristides tells the Emperor, "Since I read in their writings, I was fully assured of these things, as also of things which are to come."

Paul repeats God's promise (Heb. 10:16), "I will put my laws in their heart, and in their mind will I write them"; Aristides says of the Christians that they have the commands of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself engraven upon their hearts."

Paul exhorts Christians (2 Cor. 9:7) to give "not grudgingly"; Aristides says the Christians give "ungrudgingly."

In 1 Peter 1:23, we find the regenerate described as "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth for ever"; Aristides says, "Let all that are without the knowledge of God draw near there [*i.e.*, "to their doctrine"—"the gateway of light"] and they will receive incorruptible words."

John, the beloved disciple says, "Let us love one another"; Aristides says of the Christians, "And they love one another."

When we find all these expressions, or nearly all of them, occurring in a small part of the Apology, the far larger part being occupied with descriptions of opposing religious systems, we are impressed with the

fact that the thought of Aristides is saturated with ideas and expressions found in the different books of the New Testament, from the Gospels to the Revelation. Hence we cannot but assent to Harnack's view, that the discovery of the *Apology* "is a find of the first importance."

It must be plain to all that what Aristides calls "The Gospel," "the Holy Gospel writing," "their writings," "their other writings," contain what we read in our New Testament today.

It may easily be that Aelius Hadrian heard the addresses of these two apologists on that Mars' Hill that Areopagus, where Paul preached that wonderful sermon in a few words to the Stoic and Epicurean philosophers. But wherever these two men stood addressing the Emperor of Rome in the year 125 A.D., that occasion was a memorable one, and if we fail to witness this scene as one never to be forgotten it must be because imagination has suffered a strange paralysis.

In the brief quotation by Eusebius from the *Apology* of Quadratus we see the wonders of the apostolic age; and in that of Aristides we hear the very words which those who saw these miracles with their own eyes wrote, making the New Testament, which Quadratus found it his privilege to distribute that men might know Him whose portrait shines from its pages. Aristides said, "And if you would read, O King, you may judge of the glory of His presence from the holy Gospel writing as it is called among themselves."

One of the most impressive utterances of Aristides is his insistence that Hadrian should read these writings that he might feel the "power" that is in them. And have we not felt that "power" convincing us of sin and drawing us to our Saviour?

The last words of Christ to His disciples on the

Mount of Olives, were, "Ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." He had already told them, "Ye shall be brought before kings and rulers," and here, in Athens, we see two of His witnesses pleading with the greatest ruler on earth to read this Word that he might feel its power to save. Shall it lie on our own tables unread and unfelt?

We have the whole Apology of Aristides, showing that he had our New Testament; but we have only a small scrap of that of Quadratus. But we have that short passage which Eusebius, having the whole Apology in his hands, copied from it. Quadratus tells Hadrian that he was a contemporary of those who were healed and raised from the dead while Christ was on earth and after His ascension. "Such was Quadratus," says Eusebius, and this witness tells Hadrian, not simply what he believed, but what he knew, having seen.

Is not this as convincing as any legal deposition could be? Is it not, to us, as if we had heard Quadratus tell Hadrian these things? When we read such a deposition, so to speak, by such a man, in such circumstances, can we doubt its truth?

WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

THE REVIEW

CURRENT THOUGHT AND ACTIVITY

AN UTTERANCE IS SOMETIMES EVEN MORE FORCIBLE WHEN LIFTED out of its context than when left imbedded in some extended account or argument. Here are several taken from recent literature, and given without comment:

"It is hardly worth while to attack errors in any other way than by spreading understanding."—*Norman Hapgood in The Forum.*

"Yet all experience shows that capacity for sacrifice is a necessary condition of achievement. The power to do is conditioned upon the power to do without."—*Rev. John Augustine Ryan in The Forum.*

"There are more pragmatists among the rank and file of the people than among philosophers. To them the whole meaning of a conception lies in its practical consequences."—*William Bennett Munro in Foreign Affairs.*

"There is no other impediment in the world today so hindering human progress as an intellectual habit of mind fostered by, and exemplified in, debate and argument and controversy."—*A Lay Sermon in the Journal, Knoxville.*

"The greatest sin is not lust nor dishonesty nor drunkenness; it is the pride of trying to do without God. The sins or attitude are more dangerous and more subtle than the sins of the flesh."—*Rev. S. M. Shoemaker, Jr.*

"A creed is easily written, but unless it is the product of a mighty travail for the truth and is born out of the very heart of a crisis in the Church's history, it will not live long enough to be even a memory."—*The Lutheran.*

"It will doubtless always be true that *omnia exeunt in mysterium*; but at least there is a zest in widening the arch of twilight that surrounds our little camp pitched in the wilds of the universe."—*Sir W. Beach Thomas in The Atlantic Monthly.*

"It is a strong proof of the Gospel teaching that it takes

something more than things, than means of comfort, than entertainment, than knowledge to satisfy the hunger of the soul; it goes to prove the truth of the old saying that man's soul was made for God and it finds no rest until it finds it in Him."—*Boston Transcript*.

"And, in all the present crisis, history oddly repeats itself. We are back in the late Victorian era, in the days of Kipling and of the Russian menace, when India was the objective of Czarist Russia and the 'inevitable conflict' of the future was between Slav and Briton."—*Frank H. Simonds in The American Review of Reviews*.

"Our weakness lies not in our differences, but in the infantile spirit of prejudice that still insists that each little group of believers be herded together under a separate name and be branded by some common motto that differentiates their peculiar, and relatively unimportant, differences from other bodies of Christians."—*Henry Leach Goddard*.

"If you want to believe in God you will have to divorce yourself from the kind of immoral nationalism which laughs at humanity. If you want to believe in God you must disavow an industrialism and commercialism which puts privilege before personality and substitutes new forms of slavery for old ones."—*President Bernard Iddings Bell of St. Stephen's College*.

"The so-called 'Catholic' reaction, in the midst of which we find ourselves, is a direct challenge to all that we Free Churchmen stand for and count precious. We cannot meet it by mere negations, but only by positive reassertion, both in theory and practice, of those spiritual values which we have inherited and which alone constitute our *raison d'être*."—*Principal W. B. Selbie in the Christian World, London*.

DOES THE CANDIDATE FOR MEMBERSHIP IN YOUR CHURCH KNOW what it means to enter into this relationship? Has the profound spiritual nature of Christianity been made plain to him, or is he left to the vague idea that he is entering some society which combines good morals with good deeds, and so helps to "bring in the Kingdom"? Apparently a large portion of our church members know really little of the significance of Christianity, and there are consequently appalling numbers of religious ignoramuses in the church. No wonder then, that, with all the

church's wealth, its various causes go begging and cannot meet the demands upon them.

Before you can have a church in the truest sense, and before it can function with power in its collective capacity, it must be composed of real Christians. The person considering membership must be made to know its full significance, that it is not a mere social organization to be entered at will.

Bishop A. W. Leonard, in addressing a recent meeting of the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, made this demand for a basis upon which alone people are to be admitted to the church of Christ:

"For all too long the Church held herself to a narrow individualism. This individualism at times closed its eyes to the social conditions obtaining in the life of the day. Then her emphasis swung to the other extreme and modern social prophets were heard on every hand. In this social period, that of today, many have seemed to have forgotten that the gospel is both individualistic and social. Dean Knudson, of the Boston University School of Theology, has well said, 'At present the tendency is to put so much stress upon social environment that the individual is threatened with a new spiritual bondage.' There is also grave danger of schemes and systems of modern religious education becoming so mechanical as to lose all sense of the spiritual. Educational systems, however good, cannot be a substitute for the individual's personal relation to God, and can under no circumstances become a substitute for conversion and the experience of the new birth. Let the Church and her ministers call the world to repentance and let it be made plain that no one can qualify for membership in the society of Christ who cannot say, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.' This is the basis of all personal experience and the Church has always declined in power and influence when this note of personal experience has been wanting. We may establish our age limits, and have our plans for ingathering of members, but the real test is, do they say from their very heart, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God'? for remember 'Every spirit that confesses not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God.'"

A REAL FAITH MUST REST UPON SOMETHING MORE THAN APOLOGETICS. Logic is not enough. The appeal must be to more than

the reason alone. There are demands of the spirit itself, as a living, craving thing, that must be satisfied no less than those of one's intellectual nature.

The trouble with much of the approach to the Bible in our times is that the spirit is obliged to wait too often till the mind has investigated, analyzed, proved, and demonstrated the reliability of this or that. Entirely aside from questions of conservatism or liberalism, faith seeks to ground itself upon intellectualism, to the exclusion of the spiritual perceptions that come of the soul's relation to God. This thought is expressed by this paragraph from The Lutheran:

"We claim that what is responsible for this modern drift away from positive Christian faith is unwillingness to bow before the authority of the Word as it stands revealed in Jesus Christ. Men do not get close enough to the heart of the Scriptures to arrive at a certitude that cannot be shaken. They therefore do not speak with the inner conviction that God's Word must stand though the heavens fall. Doubt will flee before a faith that neither shrinks nor wavers but stands secure in a heaven-born assurance of hope and joy. Stanley was won from his skepticism not by argument but by the faith that shone forth in attracting brightness in the speech and the life of Livingstone. An infidel who came to argue with Fenelon was made to feel that the latter had something he did not have, and rising from his seat said, 'I must leave you; for if I stay much longer with you I shall become a Christian.' There is such a power as being mighty in the Scriptures, for they alone have the truth that can make men mighty in the faith, and it is that faith which overcometh the world. The more that faith takes hold of Christians; the more they reveal it in their speech and life; the more they sit at the feet of Christ and drink in His life-giving word, the less will they be like many of our modern men who are so easily shaken by the ever-shifting winds of an uncertain and compromising Christianity."

THE ISSUE BETWEEN RELIGION AND SCIENCE IS NOT FULLY PRESENTED when it is shown that one of them submits some thesis the other cannot accept. If they had no opposing views respecting facts, there might be no conflict, but there would still remain a gulf between them. Their great difference concerns

the satisfaction of the utmost need of the soul. The resources of the intellect cannot supply this demand, for it originates beyond the intellectual nature itself. And unless it is satisfied, and that by faith, despair comes to abide in the heart.

Among the most penetrating and discerning American writers upon spiritual matters is Dr. Bernard Iddings Bell, President of St. Stephen's College. Master of a brilliant style with the courage of his convictions, he is also clear and frank without being cynical. In a recent issue of the American Church Monthly Dr. Bell, under the caption, Faith and Fear, discusses the insufficiency of knowledge in meeting all the stresses of life. These generous quotations will repay the reader for their appraisal of faith and for their fine appreciation of the true perspective of the things of the spirit and the things of the intellect:

"It is the thesis of this essay that, for the facing of the challenges of life and learning, knowledge is not enough. Indeed, knowledge is worse than not enough, because knowledge unless supplemented is apt to remove from us that courage which results from ignorance, without establishing any new basis for courage. Thus we are rendered cowardly in meeting that which we come to know life has and holds for men. A fool may rush in where angels fear to tread; but there is a danger that the informed and experienced man will hesitate to rush in at all. Acquaintance with life makes us cautious. Scientific study makes us cautious. There is more than a chance that between them they may make us so much so that caniness becomes craven and we cease, in any real sense, even to try to find the captains of our souls or the architects of our mutual fate. To be brave one must put one's trust in someone."

"There can be no doubt that the longer we experiment with living, the harder it is to believe in the possibility of love. One means, of course, love in the sense of ultimate and intimate companionship with other than one's self, the communion of one's self, the communion of one's whole being with the being of another. We do not, to be sure, lose a sense of the power of love in terms merely of physical passion. That remains vivid, often too vivid easily to be endured when we have learned that passion does not contain *per se* that extra-physical content which adolescence is apt to suppose is of its very being. It is not

crue of many young people that in respect to love they are merely animal. They are seeking something vastly more than that. In fact, the degeneration of love into lust, a proper subject for tragedy, is simply the losing of that dream of something more. What we seek in youth through passion, what somehow every man must seek and somehow have, is a knowledge that someone cares, despite our ill-deserving; that someone understands us, stupid and inarticulate though we be. The most dreaded threat that life may hold for us lies not in pain or penury or thwarted ambition or even death; the ultimate bogey is loneliness!"

"Wife, husband, colleagues, friends: how little they can know of us or we of them. Even as we clasp our children to us we perceive well enough that they and we are vastly strangers. We are alone. It is night, amid storms. We have asked too much of human love and, because we have asked too much, too impossibly much from our lovers, we grow to hate them, revile them, divorce them, disown them, despise them. That is what experience does for honest human beings unless they have something wherewith to supplement the knowledge which experience brings. Love goes.

"Nor can there be much doubt that scientific education of our modern sort is apt to take still further from the ordinary man the joy out of living, by removing that other prop of courage, *hope*. We scientifically examine matter. The universe had seemed to us, when fools, to be a fairy-like panorama of hill and sea and sky, of snow and slanting rain, of blazing sun or cool noon and stars, of lights tempered by passing clouds; full of living realities beautiful, or terrible, or horrible; its crown and its control, a race of men on quest for something. But the ordinary mortal undergoes scientific discipline in a secularist system of education, and discovers that the whole of that vast variety is a congeries of indestructible protons and electrons moving in invariant mathematical combinations. It is a wonderful discovery; and a most depressing one. I—even I, my body, my brain—the body and brain of my beloved—the body and brain of my enemy—all are, in the last analysis, mere whirling energies. Have I a mind, a soul? Can there be any real future before me and my fellows? Are we not mere manifestations of a blind and relentless mechanism? Biology taught our fathers that men are but beasts a little more intelligent. Now come physical chemistry and behavioristic psychology to assure us that we are merely fields of intercleaving elements: our thoughts

only reactions, our hopes illusory, our loves quite non-existent, our dreams a madness, our destiny a final dissolution."

"In the face of this tragic necessity, itself inevitably the result of depending upon knowledge alone for one's approach to truth, one becomes more than a little weary at times of the people who deny that there is any great difficulty in correlating science and religion, who talk serenely of their reconciled science as though they were simply phases of the same thing; who seem to suppose that the conflict is about something of minor importance, such as whether the creation of the world took place in six days of ordinary length, whether Joshua did or did not stop the sun one afternoon, whether or not Jonah for three days occupied a piscatorial residence, whether or not the universe seemed geocentric to the prophet Ezekiel. The dispute is really everlasting and inevitable and goes to the heart of things. It deals with nothing less than whether man is free or a slave, mechanically determined or a person; whether life is or is not worth living; whether or not joy and bravery are possible for reasoning men. The solution of this basic conflict, in so far as there emerges a solution, can never be in the nature of an amalgam; it must of necessity always be in the nature of a paradox. Man is a strange creature, more strange in this, than he is an animal who, alone among animals, is inevitably in revolt against being an animal; one portion of that mathematical precision which constitutes the energetic universe, incurably resistant to its irresistible laws.

"Science tells us to observe the material and reason therefrom; to observe the animal and reason therefrom; that so we shall understand the human and comprehend ourselves. Man does as he is bid; only to find that, in the light of this knowledge of things and beast, he is inevitably both loveless and hopeless. 'This thing at which I gaze cannot be really me,' Man insists. 'It must be you,' responds Science, 'for what else can there be to you? You have observed all that is observable.' 'I am not that,' Man admits, 'a congeries of atoms, a beast; but is there not something more to me?' 'That is absolutely all,' replies Science, 'that knowledge can reveal of you. As far as Science can tell, there is nothing more.'

"There are those who try therewith to be content. They have purchased knowledge at a price, the price of love and hope and all mad, pulsing courage, and life is horrid, scarcely or not at all to be endured. But most men will not stop, cannot stop with that for long. There rises within us the ancient urge

the race, that urge as valid as the reason and as much a part of life, the urge which bids us trust the unseen, the intangible, the more than materially substantial. We make an act of faith, of faith which is 'the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.' We, the race of us, cry out, 'To know is not enough. To all scientists let due honor and acclaim be given. They know much. They know wonderful things. But they do not know everything. They do not know me. Only a few scientists know that, and those not because of their science but because they are poets as well. I may be a bit of revolving energy, but I am a free spirit too; I may be the millionth generation from an anthropoidal ancestor, but I am also a son of the most high God. I not merely know; I also believe; I also believe in the race; I believe in the future; I believe in life; I believe in love; I believe in God.'

"Out of every age of Science is born an age of Faith, so born of ultimate necessity. The man who today is ahead of the intellectual procession is he who understands and appreciates science but who realizes that science cannot explain man or reveal his destiny, who perceives that such mysteries are solved not by knowing but by believing; the man who, imitating the humility of such men as Pasteur and Pupin and J. A. Thomson and Milliken and many another mighty man of science and of imagination, recognizes that it is still, in the twentieth century as in the thirteenth, wisdom and not folly to proclaim, '*Credo ut intelligam.*'"

JUST WHAT IS THE SPIRITUAL LIFE OF WHICH WE HEAR SO MUCH, but which rather eludes every complete definition? Many confuse it with moral living, and others with the finer emotions; its Godward implications are sadly overlooked. It is not, with them, associated with prayer, with meditation upon divine things, upon the soul in its relation to its Maker. In short, they never seem to understand that spiritual life is a thing of the loftiest heights attainable to the soul—heights whence it communes with God.

Few of our modern thinkers have the penetration in these matters which characterizes Dean Inge. The Churchman has published a sermon of his upon Hebrews 4:11-12, which is a fine example of his powers of analysis and expression. After

pointing out that conforming to certain laws is not all there is to our higher life, he proceeds:

"It is rather too simple, because, as spiritual beings and agents, we have to do not with impersonal mechanical law but with the living God. For the Word of God here, as in the Old Testament, is God Himself in action, God as the Creator and Director of the world. But creation is not merely physical. It is also moral and spiritual; and in spiritual creation God does not make something which is not Himself: He creates by being present, by imparting Himself. Spiritual life consists in the intimate and searching penetration of the human mind by the living Spirit of God. So in Psalm cxxxix the wonders of our physical frame are the outward sign of the mysterious and awful intimacy of the Divine Presence, from which we cannot escape. The Psalm ends with the prayer: 'Try me, O God, and seek the ground of my heart; prove me and examine my thoughts.'

"Thus the spiritual life, which is the activity of God Himself in correspondence with our spirit, has as one of its essential factors, proving and examining, judgment, discernment, criticism. 'For judgment, for criticism,' our Lord said, 'am I come unto the world.' That is the thought of my text. The Word of God is a living Power, which penetrates to the darkest places of the soul, so that all things are naked and laid open—flayed, as it were—before His eyes. And always, as it turns the searching light upon that which we fain would hide, it divides and cuts and separates, piercing even to the dividing of soul and spirit, and quick to discern the thoughts and intents of the heart."

In a later part of his sermon he shows that our highest life demands earnest thinking; it is not a sort of comfortable conscience only. "In life as in literary style," he observes "simplicity and lucidity require a great deal more work than is apparent in the successful result." Then, after commenting upon the present conditions as they concern spiritual life, he goes on:

"What we want is to get at the heart and the spirit of the great eras of revelation, to make their inspiration ours in such a way that their soul shall again live through us, transforming a new age as only a living spirit can. If we want to preserve Greek, we must be Greeks; if we want to preserve Christianity

we must be Christians. There is no Scripture against pouring old wine into new bottles. The Word the Cutter warns us that we cannot be too distrustful of names and labels, even the most venerable. That is, of course, the message of the prophet: 'Speak no more lying words, saying, The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, are these.' The Dividing Word will have none of these external classifications. Ruthlessly it cuts across and across them, till a man's foes may be those of his own household and his friends among the outlaws in the tents of Kedar. It is a hard saying but it must be learned. When the devil captures an organization framed to defeat him he never changes the label. Most institutions do tend to strangle the ideas which gave them birth. The Spirit of Truth will not be imprisoned in any of them."

THE EDITOR OF THE EXPOSITORY TIMES HAS BEEN DOING A wise thing—one especially neglected today. He has been re-reading a strong book. The book is Otto's *The Idea of the Holy*, reviewed some time ago in these pages. In so doing he has gained a suggestion as to a troublesome expository point in the Book of Job. What bearing on Job's afflictions had the descriptions of leviathan and behemoth, and questions about the lightning, the goats, and so on? Let the Editor answer for himself:

"Well, Otto has suggested to us where light may be found. It has not to be searched for hidden away in the long chapters in which God is represented as speaking to Job, nor has it to be distilled out of them. It is so prominently placed that it has escaped most eyes. It lies in the very opening words, 'the Lord answered Job out of the whirlwind.' *Out of the whirlwind*—those are the only really important words; all that follows is a way of illustration—illustration of the 'whirlwind' features of human experience—the bizarre, the irrational, the insoluble, the unknowable, or the unmanageable. If the story of Job be historical at all, what happened was this. Job, puzzling his brains almost to distraction about the ways of God, suddenly either witnesses or remembers a whirlwind, that incalculable, inexorable, but majestic natural phenomenon. In the world of Nature, so orderly, so rational, there is the whirlwind to be remembered. And in the experience of man or of nations there is a 'whirlwind' feature too. Job had come into the path of a

'whirlwind.' In face of the whirlwind the dictum of Ecclesiastes holds good, 'there is one event to the righteous and to the unrighteous.' The question of personal merit or demerit is simply irrelevant.

"So Job perceives that in the 'whirlwind' experience of suffering such as his, the question of his desert did not necessarily arise at all. There is the whirlwind, and however strange it seems, and whatever problems still remain, the realization of the fact of it has this merit at least, it opens a way out of the dilemma in which Job seemed shut up—either there is no God who cares, or I must have been a great sinner. Had Job come to either of those decisions, Satan would have been right in his contention. But between his wife, who urges him to atheism, and his friends, who press for a confession, Job finds a way out. There is such a thing as the whirlwind,—that answers his friends. God is in the whirlwind,—that answers his wife.

"Again we repeat there is the 'whirlwind'—the incalculable, the inexplicable, the irrational; yes, there is all that to be possibly met in life. But God is in the whirlwind. We cannot say why the 'whirlwind' should be there: it is sufficient to know that God is in it. That is Job's view of human experience, that is Job's faith, that is what gave him peace. And even the New Testament merely makes a little more explicit what this unknown but supreme genius saw more or less clearly so long before: 'all things work together for good to them who love God.'"

IT IS A PARADOX OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE, THAT A MAN WHO DETERMINES to walk in the great Way often expects too much of himself. He makes noble resolutions, he girds up his will, he summons his courage, he strives to have faith—he starts out to be a perfect Christian, all by his own effort and all at once. Of course he soon has a bad tumble, and of course he accuses himself; he should have been as sure of himself and as steady as a veteran. What is the trouble? Well, there may be souls gifted with spiritual insight that they lay hold of everything in the right way from the very first; but most of us learn slowly and with many blunders. We must wait.

But the great point is to make a start, to keep the faith, to know that the Lord is not only with us, but with us to some purpose, to hold Him so supremely in our lives that no matter

how long He takes to reveal Himself we find all the attractions in the world dim beside that steady flame of hope that shines within us.

In writing, in *The British Weekly*, upon *The Reasonableness of the Supernatural*, Dr. Hutton has described Pentecost in a way to enlighten and hearten those of us who have been straining our eyes needlessly for the vision that comes only in its own time, and our muscles to accomplish alone the task for which divine help is essential, and is promised:

“For what is the story in simple terms? Some men, eleven in all, had been with Jesus for three years. We need not ask too curiously on what terms, with what purposes or ambitions of their own, they had accompanied Him. If, at the first and perhaps even to the end, they or some of them imagined that they were going to get something out of Christ—well, in that case they were not the first and they were not the last to enter with mixed motives upon a course which later on they found they could keep to only on the *highest* motives! It is a great part of the loving ingenuity of God to get all of us committed to the great obediences on motives of our own; and yet later (God be praised!) when those poorer motives break down or are thwarted something has already come to us which enables us to go on. Many a man begins with himself and ends with God. Indeed that is the very history of man.

“For three years they were together, Jesus and those eleven, they catching His great meaning doubtless now and then, but losing it entirely for long and wide spaces of time. At length, this Leader of theirs was put to death: a horrid death! They thought to themselves—‘well, now, that’s over!’ In fact they said as much. Nay, they said more than that. One by one they set out for their old homes, proposing to go back to their old tasks and ways of living. We do not know whether any of them every really got back. If any of them ever got back they did not stay.

“For it is simply the historical fact that Jesus Christ has spoiled life for us all—on the old terms! He has heightened the human tragedy. If we had never known Him, well, there is no end to the kind of things we might have done or might have been. But now that we have seen Him we can never again be as though we had not seen Him. We may try to. We have all tried to. I have no doubt we shall continue to try. But al-

ways with the same result. We shall come back. They came back.

"I think we shall be right to say that they did not arrange together to come back. You cannot *arrange* anything in this deep region of the soul. There things happen always and only of necessity.

"They came back, one by one, and met together. They gathered in the upper chamber round His empty chair. It was that empty chair that did it! They looked at it and looked away, burying their heads in their hands. They looked again, first one and then another. Then they looked at each other and then all, by one impulse, towards that empty chair. And behold, it was empty no more! They saw Him there, in the flesh, and out of it; in their warm hearts, and in God!"

HUMAN NATURE FINDS IT EASIER TO FORGIVE GROSS SINS THAN PETTY MEANNESSSES. And this springs from the intuitive perception that sins of the spirit are worse than sins of the flesh. Men know that the great passions that assail life and often sweep it into disaster are common to souls noble and base, but that deliberate, calculating, petty selfishness belongs to small natures alone; the generous are incapable of it. And, to turn the thought around, even little kindnesses of heart win gratitude and love, while the undeniably moral life, without largeness of sympathy, evokes little response, even where it confers benefits of a sort.

It is on this ground more often than on any other that Christians fail as witnesses for their Lord. What influence can one have as a winner of souls if, with the soundest possible doctrine and undoubted faith, his conduct is lacking in courtesy, tact, sympathy, unselfishness, and all the manifestations of love? The Christian Advocate (New York) vividly illustrates the practical and vital importance of kindness in the work of evangelizing non-Christians by this account of a recent conference of workers held in Budapest:

"There was a notable gathering of Christian workers in Budapest in April. Men and women came to it from both hemispheres. Some of them were Jews who had become Christians. Some were Christians who were giving the best of their thought

and energy to the difficult task of leading Jews to accept Jesus of Nazareth as their Messiah. The common objective of all who took part in the conference was the study of the most desirable and effective methods of approaching the problem of Christianizing the Jew—admittedly one of the fundamental problems of world evangelism, one to which a solution must be found and yet a problem with which as yet few Christians have ever grappled successfully.

"Philosophers were there with their theories. The psychologist and pedagogue presented their suggestions. The appeal to sentiment, to emotion, to the intellect—all had their hearing. But the most practical idea presented was that brought forward by Ruth Rouse, of the Young Women's Christian Association, who went straight through theory to practice and brought back this arresting report:

"I have asked students converted from Judaism to Christianity in many countries throughout Europe what was the first thing that made them begin to move toward Christianity. Always the reply was the same: "An act of disinterested kindness from a Christian."

"An American worker who had made a systematic inquiry into the causes which had operated to make the Jewish mind impenetrable to Christianity, received the same answer in 98 cases out of 100. Another man from a city of Eastern Europe reported that out of 4,000 cases handled only two could offer any other adequate reason for becoming Christians than the evidence of the love of Christ as exhibited in the kind deeds of His professed followers. Such personal kindness had in some cases overcome the bitterest hatred and religious prejudice.

"There is not much use in assuming that preaching, education, or argument will effect the conversion of non-Christians, whether Jew or Gentile, apart from the supporting evidence of Christ-controlled and Christ-animated life."

THE EVANGELICAL CHURCHES IN EUROPE HAVE BEEN PASSING through harsh times since the Great War closed. As so often in history, however, severe experiences are proving a sifting, trying, strengthening process. They are developing the moral heroism and endurance of the members of the Protestant churches as nothing has done for some time. Moreover there are cheering results. The Presbyterian makes this comment upon the conversion of a prominent man in Hungary:

"A very notable conversion has recently occurred in Hungary, which has deeply impressed the public. Mr. Hegedus is a banker, writer, politician and capitalist, interested in various industries. Through reading the Bible, he was saved from ending his own unhappy career; and is now going from town to town, giving the good news to many others. The entire nation has been stirred by the striking conversion of this noted personality. The Church of Rome is thrice active in her efforts in Hungary, but Protestants, too, are awake. Debrecin, which has been the center of Calvinism, has recently witnessed a convocation of three thousand ministers, when there was formed the Presbyter's League. Rome requires Papal succession; the Eastern Church claims Apostolic succession, but the Reformed Churches have been content with 'the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.' It is a significant distinction which there in Central Europe, where Rome repudiates all others, means intellectual as well as doctrinal discrimination. It is to be noted that the numbers alone do not account for the influence of Calvinists, for intellectually, over all the Continent, these small groups of Protestants exert a profound influence."

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, AS THE WITNESS FOR CHRIST BEFORE the world, is properly credited with those moral standards which distinguish Western civilization. But civilization does not of necessity mean Christianity; the fact that it has adopted Christian standards of conduct in the past is no assurance that it must or will always maintain them. If society throws aside the moral code which the church has given it, the church may protest, but it cannot command. This is seen in the opposed attitudes of church and state respecting the divorce evil. Neither can the church, today at any rate, depend for support upon the great schools that have sprung from that enlightenment it has fostered.

If the present laxity in ideas of propriety and in moral principles and conduct is to be overcome, the Christian church must again take the field alone as the champion of virtue and righteousness. The Churchman summons it to just such a campaign when it thus presents the situation:

"'Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way?' Or as a modern translator phrases it: 'How can a young man keep

'clean?' This has been a real problem for the young man of every generation. If he would keep his body in temperance, soberness and chastity he must learn to control his elemental impulses. But many things conspire to make this self-conquest extremely difficult for the youth of today.

"The freedom and intimacy which characterize the companionship of boys and girls nowadays expose them to many new temptations. The modern girl has thrown reserve to the winds. At that period in life when the boy should have his mind on other things and should be aided in leading a carefully disciplined life, he is subjected to influences which deliberately stimulate his sex instincts. This is true of the books he reads, the plays and amusements offered him and even of much present-day conversation. More dangerous still is the teaching he is likely to receive in the name of physiology or psychology about the supposed necessity for sex expression and the dangers of repression. Any temptation to break over the Christian moral code and to yield to indulgence is reinforced by the assurances from scientific authorities that evil consequences may now be avoided.

"As for the moral code, he learns to his amazement that teachers of ethics and religion are to be found who are quite ready to throw it into the discard. They are actually encouraging the youth to make experiments with a view to developing their own codes.

"Imagine the young man fighting the age-long battle of the spirit against the flesh under such circumstances as these! Could there be a finer challenge to the Church than his plight?"

SOMETIMES OF FLOOD THERE ARE SOMETIMES PLACES SUFFICIENTLY high to seem beyond reach of the unruly waters, but people who seek refuge there may soon feel to their dismay the waves about their feet.

So in the moral world. Things may become pretty bad among the confessedly wicked, lower standards may be adopted by the frankly worldly-minded, but those great strongholds of uprightness, the church and the schools, are surely beyond the reach of positive evil. But are they? A few decades ago we associated brazen immorality with the slums. Of course immorality was common enough beyond those depressing regions, but it existed furtively, and in decent circles was frowned

down. Moral standards were fixed. They were not to be questioned in principle even by those who ignored them in practice. But now—those muddy waves threaten every institution. There have been warnings, exhortations, proposals, organizations, demands that something be done—all without end, yet matters have become steadily worse. We have even come to a time when the college professor and the clergyman himself can keep his position while in theory at least he openly accepts the philosophy of the libertine.

The most notorious instance of this occurred at the recent conference of the Episcopal Church in San Francisco where, according to report, a minister did not hesitate to defend the idea of "companionate marriage." To the honor of that communion, however, the utterance has not gone unrebuked. Bishop William T. Manning of New York is one of those who has not hesitated to speak his mind on this point, and as quoted in the press he thus expressed himself:

"There seems to be a group in the church itself which holds that the church may 'consider with an open mind' sanctioning fornication among our young people with the use of birth control to guard against the coming of children. This is, in plain words, what the high-sounding phrase 'companionate marriage' means, and yet this proposal was mentioned as one which consideration should be given at the recent church conference in San Francisco and its consideration is being commended by not a few professors in our universities.

"I was shown only a few days ago a questionnaire which was sent out by a male professor in one of our best known women's colleges to the young women of that institution, which not only is the so-called 'companionate marriage' definitely suggested but the questions asked of these girls are of such a nature that it would be improper for me to quote them here, and within a week or two I have had a letter from a young woman student in another college in another part of the country telling me that in her sociology course she has been assigned 'companionate marriage' as her topic for a paper which she is to prepare.

"And I see that a prominent preacher in this city, if he is correctly reported, preaching to a body of students, scoffed at the idea of 'trying to send a new generation into the world with

definite code of right and wrong' and told these young people that the old ideas of 'right' and 'wrong' have been dropped and that the criterion of behavior is simply what we happen to regard as 'beautiful' and 'ugly'—which means, I suppose, that there is no longer any law of God which is binding upon us and that our only standard is our own taste or preference."

IS THERE NO SUCH THING AS RIGHTEOUS ANGER ANY MORE? We are sometimes amazed at the things endured with mild protest, not with actual indifference. This seems to be one of the penalties of the greater culture of our times. The emotions are not so marked, we are less demonstrative, we argue rather than demand, and we are more sensitive about unpleasant scenes, and we shrink from drawing attention to ourselves by denouncing openly some objectionable act or word. The United Presbyterian has called attention to the fact that the element of hate is necessary to the make-up of an upright individual and of a social group of high standards:

"Love and hate are revelations of character. When you know what a person loves and hates, and the measure of his passion, you know what kind of person he is. He is morally defective who does not hate sin and is not displeased with him who commits it. Abhorrence of uncleanness is indispensable to purity. Could a humane person stand by and see a ruffian deliberately abuse a helpless child and show no indignation? The colder one is the greater is his hatred of unholiness.

"The more one loves music, the more abhorrent to him is discordant jangling. The more one loves art, the more abhorrent to him are the 'crude colors which swear at each other.' The more one loves purity, the more indignant he is when he sees music and art ministering to lust.

"One of the signs of national decay is the decline of anger and the absence of moral indignation. For the physician, nothing is more ominous than the loss of the sense of pain. The superficial observer may think that the patient is better because he is quieter, but the doctor knows that the end is near.

"One of the greatest needs of our day is a revival of social anger. Vice and political corruption have made our cities a disgrace and yet no blow is struck strong enough to sting the calloused sides of vice protectors. The lawlessness that goes unpunished by our officials; the shameless co-operation between

our police officials and the criminal classes; the known participation of some high officials in bootlegging, should be met by burning denunciation upon the part of all good citizens, instead of the comparative indifference seen on every side. This indifference reveals a measure of decay in the moral sense of the people that augurs ill."

IS NOTHING WORTH WHILE UNLESS IT IS NEW? APPARENTLY many regard the old as valueless, save as it offers certain esthetic advantages. People of modern habits of mind often are not satisfied with perfectly good things—houses, grounds, clothes, books, recreation—unless these things express the latest ideas. Even in fiction, which deals with the unchanging emotions of human life, most of us want the latest best seller, though it will be forgotten next year, while the old "standard" writers continue to win their admirers.

We lack, individually, adequate principles, criteria, by which to appraise things, and so we fall back upon mere likes and dislikes or simply run with the crowd. Yet there are standards to go by if we will adopt them. Sir Josiah Stamp, an eminent economist of Great Britain, and an associate of George Dawes on the Reparations Commission, has pointed some of them out, in addressing young people. Referring to their attitude toward the great institutions they find in the world he says:

"I think there are general principles applicable to them as to the institutions of society, of learning, of science, of politics, of religion. May I give you one or two homemade canons of judgment and action? First of all, I would emphasize that in this age sometimes we are rather inclined to think wisdom began in the twentieth century. We cannot think sacrifice began in the twentieth century, though there is glorious evidence that the spirit of it can be continued.

"The thing we want most of all is a reverence for old-established movements, for the ability, for the courage, for the endurance, for the spirit that went to make them what they are. Don't dismiss things because they had their roots in the ancient past, but rather, on the contrary, imagine because they have stood the test of time there must be, all appearances notwithstanding, something real and enduring in them.

"In the second place, we have, however, to realize that we have the responsibility of testing. We have to prove all things. We must re-try, re-test. Having regard to the welter of speech and printed matter, I think it is worth while spending half an hour to settle how you are going to devote the next two hours. I recommend twenty per cent allowance planning out how to avoid an avalanche of the less worthy, as an economical investment of time.

"If I may give one hint, it is this: As far as possible, go to first-hand authorities. Go to the man who has seen, and not to the man who has merely heard what has been seen. I beg of you to devote a little time in going, in all institutions, to the root of the thing, to the men who know, that you may get at the truth."

ONE EXPLANATION OF THE CHURCH'S COMPARATIVE LACK OF power today can be compressed into one word—intellectualism. By this is not meant merely liberal theology or destructive criticism, but the enthronement of man's intellect above his spiritual and moral natures until his life lacks balance. This has been a natural result of overwhelming emphasis upon education at a time when it is so largely colored by materialistic science.

But, apply any idea to excess and you develop a reaction. There is evidence now of restlessness in the hearts of people, including many of the young, who have pretty thoroughly tested the capacity of the intellect to satisfy all the demands of life, and have found it wanting. The many-sided human soul has many needs; nothing that responds to one side only can possibly prove sufficient. Provision for the intellect is not enough while spiritual hunger remains. Since the stronghold of intellectualism is in the colleges, the growing attention to religion there is significant. Good in themselves as are those things the schools have to offer, it seems that there are students who long for something a rich curriculum cannot supply. An address before the Northern Baptist Convention at Chicago by Dr. Allyn K. Foster, general secretary of student work, encourages the hope that another spiritual revival, of vast mean-

ing, may be at hand. Drawing particularly upon his experience with students the speaker said:

"This last has been the most deeply evangelistic year I have known in the colléges. Not a single moment have I spent more than seven years on theological controversy. I have had no theological or scientific creed that I wished to foist upon anybody, but have sought to add the clear findings of science to the confirmation of the old evangelical truths of God, sin, redemption, prayer, conversion and immortality. Everywhere in all the thirty-seven institutions I visited last year I have kept central the appeal to the heart, and I can report that never before the response been so striking. In one of the great schools of the country out of 150 boys present, two-thirds of them renewed their loyalty to the church. The other third made their first confession of faith in Jesus. Other instances could be cited. I think you ought to know my impression that in all our schools, colleges or universities a deeper interest in religion is manifest. College presidents are meeting to confer about this matter, schools of religion are springing up everywhere, and college professors in many institutions I could mention, see more clearly than ever the place of vital religion, both intellectually and socially in the life of the campus. I am making an earnest appeal for students and teachers in this time of great intellectual bewilderment. They need interpretation I know but much more they need and are eager for contact with the living Christ. They will respond to any man who in his life and message reflects the Spirit of Jesus. The Wesleyan revival of the eighteenth century did not touch the theology or the intellectualism of its day. It was the impact of holy living that recrowned Christ in that day. In my judgment, based upon intimate knowledge of several hundred schools in all the States of the Union, we are facing the greatest religious revival in our colleges that we have known in half a century. Many signs point that way. We have thrown many obstacles in the way of our young people these last ten, terrific, years. The sin of our generation is intellectualism, which always clutches terms from which the contents have been emptied. Rationalism, whether theological or scientific, is always both acrid and arid, and has had a devastating effect upon the students and teachers of our schools. This Convention ought to remedy that by pointing out again the spiritual finality of the gospel, whatever its intellectual form it may take."

THE RUSH FOR "WHITE COLLAR" JOBS IS A PHENOMENON OF OUR times, and various learned professions are becoming crowded. Yet not all. Already a dearth of physicians is predicted for America, and men are increasingly avoiding the ancient and honorable profession of school teaching, referring to the public schools. In the ministry much the same thing holds good. The fact seems to be, that commercialism has so infected modern ideas of success that most young men have an eye to temporal advantages first of all when considering their life work.

Even the Church of England is feeling the results of this trend; young men are not offering themselves in her service in numbers sufficient to meet the demands. Crockford's Clerical Directory, for 1927, has this decidedly pessimistic comment on the situation:

"There is no apparent prospect of any considerable increase in the immediate future. It looks as if the Church of England cannot count on more than about 350 new recruits a year for some time to come. Of these a very large number are quite unable to provide themselves with an adequate education. The average age of the existing clergy was said, a short time ago, to be nearer sixty than fifty, and this means that the rate of death and retirement, which appears at present to be about 550 per annum, will accelerate rapidly during the next ten years. The situation is in reality even worse than the bare figures suggest. . . . It is not too much to say that if the history of the last ten years is continued for another ten the effective maintenance of the parochial system will have become impossible in all but a few favored localities. Anything which can fairly be called the Church of England will have ceased to exist, and its place will have been taken by the sporadic activities of a denomination."

WHEN THESE LINES ARE READ THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON Faith and Order, held at Lauzanne, will have become a matter of the history of the church. It has been found impracticable to attempt a review of its results in this issue, as there is hardly time to gain a clear perspective of the proceedings, their meaning and value, before the matter for the October issue must be in the printer's hands. However, Dr. Vernon Bartlet of Mans-

field College, Oxford, contributed to The Christian Union Quarterly just before the conference opened, "an unofficial interpretation" of The Lausanne Agenda which contained such a fine statement respecting the watchword of that gathering that we reproduce these paragraphs:

"Let us try to envisage beforehand the exact situation. We meet frankly to face the facts, all the facts. There are facts of diversity, and particularly differences of emphasis, which affect the intangible reality we call the spirit of a 'church' or special communion, what the world calls a 'denomination' (the term the associations of which must be left behind, if we are to meet to good purpose). But far bigger is the fact of unity, a God-made spiritual fact, underlying all others and so growing increasingly realized by us all as to constrain us to meet and, together, to face the differences, according to God's will for the Church Universal. Our watchword, then, is 'unity in diversity,' so understood as to do new justice to the positive, the divinely-willed aspect of diversity, so that it shall persist within our heightened unity as an element of enriching variety, answering to the many-sided range of human capacity. In other words, the unity we meet to plan and further is one in which all diversity of proved value shall persist, and, indeed, spread more generally, yet no longer into division, but rather, as a fresh force and bond of fellowship. It was this ideal of unity which inspired the noble Lambeth Appeal of the Anglican Episcopate in 1920; and it is ours to try to prepare the way for its realization, so far as Christians are ripe for it.

"What specially marks our Conference is a new consciousness that we, while members of Christian communions, differing in certain respects, yet meet as brethren already one in a vital or saving faith in Christ as 'our Life' and common Head. Thus in principle at least, an inner and spiritual church unity already exists between the several communions in and through which we have become members of Christ. Frank recognition of varied sorts of Christian experience, as proved legitimate by the Spirit's fruits of Christlike character, has led us inevitably to a recognition of the organized groups called 'churches,' in which this or that spiritual type is characteristic, as genuine parts of the one Church, the Body of the one Christ, their common Head, even although their precise relation to the visible aspect of that one Body remains indeterminate and although many of them are in formal outward schism from each other.

True, the New Testament knows no such churches, in the sense of denominations. It knows only the one Church Universal and the particular local embodiments of that Church's life in miniature.

"But once those developments have arisen, whatever their original occasions, it is ours to ask how best the different values which they to-day serve to emphasize, but also to over-emphasize in mutual separation, can be made to minister no longer to division but to normal fellowship of a richer kind than any now existing, or indeed possible within any of these isolated church groups. In addressing ourselves to this problem, let us bear in mind all the time some golden words of the Lambeth Appeal. They are these: 'For *all* the truly equitable approach to union is by the way of *mutual* deference to one another's consciences.'"

IN THIS TIME OF SO MUCH DISSENSION AMONG PROTESTANTS—perhaps more correctly among Protestant leaders—over questions theological and Biblical, there is a certain disposition to compare the genius of Protestantism with that of Catholicism, often somewhat to the disparagement of the former. Now, no system of things in this world is perfect throughout, so that, in making comparisons, it is essential that things be taken *in toto*, that particular features are not magnified until they are seen out of proportion.

The very word catholic itself has a broader significance than is allowed it when it is attached to only one division of the church. Are the character, the aims, the work, the accomplishments of the Protestant church as a whole such as to permit the application of the word to it? Dr. P. Carnegie Simpson believes so, as these vigorous sentences of his show:

"Today there are put before us, with special distinctiveness because of their close juxtaposition, two readings of the Christian religion and two ideals of its character and of its working. We call them the 'Evangelical' and the 'Catholic.' I have no desire to antagonize these more than need be. Both have large areas in common, alike in the fundamental articles of doctrinal faith and also in the deepest realities of religious experience. Many in both schools believe in Christ and know Christ. But there are differences and even contradictions between these

readings and ideas of Christianity which cannot be ignored. I am not going to enter at present into any general debate about these. I want to speak on but one aspect of them. It is often assumed that the 'Catholic' system, whether or not it is the truer, is, at any rate, the larger. I do not mean larger in its numbers of adherents, but larger in its conception of the religious life and of its ways of working; while, similarly, it is often assumed that 'evangelicalism,' even if it be true, is narrow in its range and limited in its outlook. Now this is pure delusion. It is the very reverse of the truth. It is time we Evangelicals asserted far more confidently and even loudly—which I do not mean controversially—that we are the true 'catholics,' that our ideas of religion and our ideas of its working are far the larger ideas and are the only ideas adequate alike to Christ's truth and life's facts."

THERE ARE SOME PROBLEMS WHICH NEVER SEEM TO BE SOLVED. One of these concerns loyalty to church and state. Should the church enjoin one thing in some crisis and the state command another, which am I to obey? But, besides the claims of church and of state, there is a third factor in the case, and one which in the last analysis must decide, and that is the individual conscience, using the term conscience in the comprehensive sense of moral judgment and approval. If we are going to be clear in the question, it is necessary to inquire into what we mean by the church and the state. An editorial in *The Watchman and Examiner* gives considerable help toward enabling one to see where duty lies here, so we quote most of it:

"The theory of religion as superior to the state is only one instance of the general principle that makes religion superior to every other factor in human living. But this principle does not necessitate the theory that a religious organization composed of fallible human beings is superior to another organization composed of the same kind of human beings. That we ought to obey God rather than men does not mean that we ought to obey churchly authority as superior to political authority; for churchly authority in its actual possible working is quite as truly the authority of men as is the authority of the state.

"The ancient phrase, 'Keeper of the king's conscience,' is merely a technical form of words, for no man is ever empow-

ered to serve as an authority over the conscience of any other man. If any person claims such authority, either for himself or for any ecclesiastical official, he makes a claim that the majority of thinking civilized men of today would openly disavow. A rivalry between church and state is not a rivalry between God and man. It is a rivalry between one group of men, and another group of men who may or may not be equally God-fearing in thought and action.

"Disobedience to law then can defend itself only when proceeding from definite conscientious individual conviction. How real and how conscientious the conviction may be in any given instance can be known only to the individual himself, and we may safely hold that even he may be more or less self-deceived. How far is the violator of the prohibition law acting from an impersonal, conscientious conviction as to the unrighteousness of that law, and how far is he moved by the mere desire for liquor, strengthened or perhaps even induced by an exaggerated desire for independence of restraint?

"'True love so bound were freest,' said the gracious King Arthur when speaking of the marriage vow. The same standard may be applied in a thousand different instances. Freedom is not the unrestricted privilege of doing as we please regardless of the welfare of other people. It is not the right to exploit everybody else for our own individual advantage and pleasure. If it were, the less of such freedom men had, the better, not only for the community at large but even for themselves; because such freedom does not tend to develop character along lines that are worthy and wholesome.

"Breaches of law therefore that are instigated by private interest or pleasure should not, as Norman Hapgood has pointed out, be confused with breaches that grow out of conviction."

FIGURES MAY NOT LIE, BUT STATISTICS MAY ENCOURAGE WRONG inferences. There is a disposition to rely overmuch upon the latter in religious affairs. Suppose that statistics show that the church membership in some city increased last year by ten thousand, can the actual state of the church of Christ in that place be gauged accordingly? The new members may have come in as the result of some very real spiritual movement, and so represent actual conversions. Then again they may be the outcome of an intensive new member campaign carried on by

the churches united for this "drive." So with some other things that are presented to us in imposing tables of figures.

Then, too, even if statistics are accurate and in no way misleading, it is a mistake to get into the habit of judging things chiefly by arithmetical values. The greatest things are not thus appraised. In an article in *The Christian Advocate* Bishop Berry of the Methodist Episcopal Church includes this live paragraph upon statistics and the mechanism they so often represent:

"In pushing forward our aggressive enterprises, *we must cease to worship at the shrine of statistics.* The multiplication table is of less consequence than many people think. And we can no longer depend upon the inspiration of mere shibboleths. The man who has a genius for the invention of ecclesiastical machinery must be sent to the rear. Mechanics must give place to dynamics. And all our service must rest in a profound conviction that we are doing this work because God has summoned and commissioned us, and because He still expects us to carry through herculean undertakings for the building of his kingdom. If we have any proper appreciation of what this responsibility really means, can we fail to seek the endowment of the Holy Spirit? Is not this still the dispensation of Pentecost? Have any promises which centered in the 'upper room' been withdrawn or modified?"

ALMOST EVERY INSTITUTION, LIKE EVERY SORT OF MACHINE, HAS to have an overhauling occasionally. If this is neglected in the machine there will develop friction, noise, loss of power, even a breakdown. The parallel in the institution is very close. Some things become worn out, and some become out of date. Even changes in design are necessary to meet changes in conditions. The church itself does not escape this rule. Sometimes a method suited to a particular community at a given time will not prove satisfactory elsewhere and in another period. Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, in his Commencement address at Union Seminary, made this demand upon the church in the matter of readjustment, and while one would have to know his meaning better on some points before endorsing him fully, there are others respecting which such counsel is needed:

"Just as our great industries are giving more attention to their research laboratories, so must the church give more thought to religious research. The rapid extension of church institutions has been accompanied with some waste and ineffectiveness. There must be a re-examination of the purposes and objectives of such enterprises as foreign missions and social service. Some of our ecclesiastical machinery may have to be scrapped. For the next few years at least, the church faces a period of intensive revision rather than rapid expansion. Then we shall probably have fewer and better churches."

ALL WRITING, IN THE SENSE OF LITERARY WORK, IS ADVERTISING. Whether the product of your pen is a book on philosophy or an advertisement of the soap you use in washing your hands, you are seeking to catch the attention, arouse the interest, and influence the actions of other men. It would be a good thing if prospective ministers, teachers, and writers of all kinds took a systematic course in advertising. Of course those educators who have, all unknowingly, become members of the intellectual cult may lift their eyebrows, and noses, at the idea of permitting anything suggesting trade to intrude upon the cloistered atmosphere of a class in literature or any other subject in a finely arranged educational curriculum. Well, readjustment of one's views is often not so much an act of intelligence as a feat of moral strength. That is one reason why the race has moved so slowly—it is so hard to realize that the fine idea of yesterday may not fit into life at all today.

Commercial advertising was at first only a more or less crude way of letting people know that you had a certain thing to sell; but, aided by psychology, it became to all intents and purposes a science, and now, if not an art in itself, it is at least a field where art is exploited. All this means a distinct branch of activity, with important ramifications and with a philosophy of its own—a discipline that is not wisely overlooked.

Now, modern advertising is not only turning out a mass of printed matter about things bought and sold, but it is developing a really valuable literature upon advertising itself, and to this the professional speaker and writer may profitably

turn his attention. In Advertising and Selling, a fortnightly periodical, Mr. Claude C. Hopkins, called by the publishers "America's most highly paid copywriter," has been telling the story of his life as an advertising man, and we commend it to the class in homiletics. While the quotations that follow deal with the business of putting commercial products before the world, it does not tax the imagination to apply them to a wider and higher field. Among other things it appears that Mr. Hopkins' later success was due largely to his early poverty, but not merely because of poverty's proverbial capacity to develop the homely virtues, for he says:

"Through father I gained poverty, and that was another blessing. Father was the son of a clergyman. His ancestors far back had been clergymen, bred and schooled in poverty, so this was his natural state.

"I owe much to that condition. It took me among the common people, of whom God made so many. I came to know them, their wants and impulses, their struggles and economic simplicities. These common people whom I know so well became my future customers. When I talk to them, in print or in person, they recognize me as one of their kind.

"My words will be simple, my sentences short. Scholars may ridicule my style. The rich and vain may laugh at the factors which I feature. But in millions of humble homes the common people will read and buy. They feel that the writer knows them. And they, in advertising, form 95 per cent of our customers."

Then, further on, he refers to the way the commercial world judges the advertising man's qualifications. Would the world of the church really suffer if it gave more attention to such points as these in choosing and preparing its ministry:

"Let me digress here to emphasize that the road to success lies through ordinary people. They form the vast majority. The man who knows them and is one of them stands the vastly better chance.

"Two of the greatest successes I have ever known in advertising were very ignorant men. They are now heads of agencies. One of them has made millions in advertising—a man who can hardly sign his name. But he knew ordinary people, and the ordinary people bought what he had to sell.

"One of them wrote copy which would induce a farmer to mortgage his barn to respond. But his every sentence had to be edited for grammar.

"Now college men come to us by the hundreds and say, 'We have education, we have literary style.' I say to them that both those things are handicaps. The great majority of men and women cannot appreciate literary style. If they do, they fear it. They fear over-influence when it comes to spending money. Any unique style excites suspicion. Any evident effort to sell creates corresponding resistance. Any appeal which seems to come from a higher class arouses their resentment. Any dictation is abhorrent to us all.

"Always we are seeking in advertising men with the impulse of the majority. We never ask their education, never their literary qualifications. Those lacks are easily supplied. But let a man prove to us that he understands human nature, and we welcome him with open arms."

THOSE WHO KNOW THEIR SIR ROGER DE COVERLY WILL RECALL the country parson who each Sunday, instead of preaching a sermon of his own, regularly read one by some noted divine. They will also remember Addison's naïve approval of this arrangement. Every live preacher who has read this quaint tale by that master of English has doubtless thought how dull a service must have been where the sermon was borrowed for the occasion. But Addison makes it all open and above board, and the discourses were at least by known masters in the pulpit. But what of that modern preacher who buys his sermons outright at the regular listed price, author unknown or at least uncredited, and palms them off as his own on Sunday mornings?

Since such productions are regularly offered to preachers, and have been for some time, there must be a market for them among men of the cloth, or the business would not continue to be exploited. The *Christian Century* devotes this bit of sarcasm to the preacher whose laziness or incompetence leads him to share in this fraud:

"The purveyors of predigested pabulum for pale parsons—that is to say, ready-to-preach sermons—grow more and more efficient in the art of saving the preacher from doing any of his own thinking. Two recent circulars—identical except for the

address of the firm and the color of the paper—offer sermon outlines ready typed, perforated, ready to go into the preacher's loose-leaf sermon book and be carried into the pulpit and preached as his own without a brain-cell being called into action. You get forty of them for ten dollars, and only one preacher in a county gets the same outlines. (This suggests the 'privacy guaranteed' of certain medical advertisements.) The series begins in September, so that the preacher who returns brain-fagged from his vacation need not think another honest thought for ten months—if he is content to be a mere loud-speaker. The September topics include 'The Laborer and His Hire' (however little it may be, it is too much for the type of laborer who buys his sermons from a mail-order house); and 'Trading in Futures' (said preacher's margin will soon be wiped out by a permanent slump in his own stock). On a special list (three for a dollar) we note a sermon on 'Be sure your sin will find you out.' If you must order, perhaps it would be well to order this one first."

THERE IS A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE LITERARY MAN AND THE WRITER OF commercial advertising which is in the latter's favor in at least one sense. So far as the reader is concerned, the advertisement is an anonymous production, though other writers would hardly consent to take up their pens if they knew that their names would not be attached to what they wrote. The writer's ego does not intrude in advertising as it is apt to do in other written matter, and this is often a decided advantage. One can think much more clearly, more objectively, if the factor of self-consciousness is entirely absent. Modern salesmanship seeks to gain the prospective buyer's viewpoint, and the "ad writer's" mind can more easily focus upon the mental process of his reader when he is not so conscious of his own.

This is a point for the public speaker and the writer to keep in mind, though each is in a position which makes lack of self-consciousness, naturalness, mental objectivity, as difficult to attain as they are valuable. The temptation to seek personal attention is shown in this excerpt from a little magazine the *Eaglet*, devoted to printing. After citing two cases of ad-

advertising copy writers who had won great distinction among the members of their craft, it continues:

"Yet the anonymity of advertising, like that of editorial writing, deprived both these gifted men of fame rightly their due and which would probably have meant more to them than money.

"In the case of the advertising writer the unfairness carries a barb peculiarly its own. Thrower of the limelight upon all else, not a ray is allowed him. He advertises everybody but himself. 'Copy' is the core of elaborate and costly machinery for building reputation, but a writer of it may not build his own.

"There is really no very good reason for this enforced obscurity. Artists who draw advertising illustrations often sign their work with name or symbol. The identity of the copy-writer could be indicated in some inconspicuous fashion. He would earn repute in his own profession, much or little according to his deserts."

IT IS NATURAL TO JUDGE A THING BY THE ATTENTION IT RECEIVES, the oratory and rhetoric it evokes or any other evidence of the public emotion it excites. Yet circumstances sometimes so favor an event that it gains applause out of all proportion to its importance, while a less spectacular occurrence passes almost unnoticed, although its influence will last much longer and be deeper and wider than the first. Moved by the mass of "poetry" called forth by Lindbergh's flight to Paris, The New York Times has observed editorially the common disparity between historic events and the poems that celebrate them, and in a disquisitional paragraph gives this striking summary:

"What was the event commemorated in the Iliad? If the Trojan war occurred at all it was in all probability a Greek raiding expedition against a third-rate Asiatic town. Topless Troy never compared for size or importance with Damascus, Smyrna, Ephesus, Nineveh, Babel. In the history of the Greek race the little barbarian chieftains who were in the habit of sulking in their tents or being murdered by their wives hardly approach the importance of Miltiades, Themistocles, Alexander the Great. But no immortal poetry is woven about Marathon or Salamis. The greatest of British ballads is not concerned

with Crécy or Poitiers or Trafalgar, but with a cattle-stealing expedition at Chevy Chase. And the next best-known military chant is not concerned with the Guards at Waterloo, but with the charge of a few hundred horsemen in the Crimea. The *Chanson de Roland* was the response to a frontier skirmish between Franks and Saracens in the Pyrenees, and not to the battle of Tours, where Charles Martel crushed the Moslem hordes. The 'Marseillaise' was not inspired by one of the great victories of Revolutionary France. It was written for the departure of a battalion of Strasbourg volunteers, many of them probably staid, stout, unheroic citizens. Our national anthem was not called forth by Bunker Hill or Saratoga or the Constitution and the *Guerrière*, but by the bombardment of a fort in Maryland which has to be looked up in the encyclopedia."

ISOLATION FROM THE WORLD, WITH ITS CONFUSION AND DISTRACTION and its persistent interference with a life that would be quiet and undisturbed, has always had a profound attraction for some temperaments. And this does not apply to minds of a religious bent only. There are hermits and recluses among all sorts of people. But it has remained for religion to give anything like formal sanction and enduring organization to results of this trait in human nature. Ecclesiastical approval opened the way for monasticism, with its good and bad features. Dr. F. H. Knubel, President of the United Lutheran Church, has touched upon both sides of monasticism in this extract from a sermon he preached to the Ministerium of Pennsylvania:

"The most important fact in the story of the Roman Catholic Church is monasticism. That Church has been nursed through the centuries in the cloister. It was a break from the cloister which shook Roman Catholicism to its foundations at the time of the Reformation. Her enduring strength is in the cloister. This last statement may cause some raising of doubtful eyebrows. We are accustomed to emphasize the strong organization of that group as the cause of their endurance. We ought, however, firmly to realize that other organizations, of even greater strength, have perished and will continue to do so. Comment is also frequently made upon the long-developed, finely articulated system of doctrine as the source of Roman Catholicism's continuance. It is a system which draws the be-

liever into absolute subjugation to the Church, and makes the individual's salvation dependent upon his soul's absorption into the organization. That system of doctrine is false, however, especially in that it forever places the church between the individual soul and its Saviour. Being false in such respect it must ultimately fail.

"This, however, is true of the Roman Catholic Church, whatever her faults of doctrine, whatever faults exist even in her monasticism. She has cultivated holiness, piety, fellowship with God, and therefore she endures. She has cultivated it in the cloister. It is there that the individual Christian finds a refuge from the thralldom of that Church, for there his individual fellowship with his Saviour is developed. Monasticism has always been a strange contradiction in this respect of all papal teaching, and has been the saving influence in that group. Almost every individual name of power in the history of the Roman Catholic Church has been the name of a monk or a friar or a nun."

Now, no intelligent person would deny that the history of monasticism has some good things to its account. Yet when the whole thing is summed up, Protestantism is justified in her opposition to it. Christ's followers are not, in this life, to be taken out of the world, but to be kept from the evil that is in the world. Any system that isolates them produces an artificial, unnatural society. The Lutheran, commenting on Dr. Knubel's sermon, expresses the idea in this way:

"That a definite and defensible objective led and leads people to withdraw from the world in search for piety, does not legitimize the claims and practises of monasticism. As a matter of fact, over-concentration along a single line of effort for godliness partially destroyed the very object of this withdrawal. The artificialities of monastic rules gave its habitues a bias which makes the Roman Catholic teachings underestimate the ordinary gifts of grace given by God to all believers, compelled them to exalt traditions to a rank equal to the Word of God, and developed that centralization of power which we know as the papacy. By a psychological process not difficult to imagine, the priesthood because of presumed superior habits of piety, came to believe itself the sole interpreter of the will of God to men, and thence attached values and uses to sacra-

ments which can only be explained by the fact that they have been performed by the priest.

"Yet back of it all lies a legitimate objective for every one born of faith in Jesus Christ, that he shall purify himself and endeavor to lead a holy life in accordance with God's will. To the degree that this is applied to all believers, this principle is correct and universal. To the degree that it applies to a certain class of Christians and to certain 'works of merit,' it is a corruption."

MOST OF US ARE PROBABLY MORE INTERESTED IN PARTICULAR forms of life on the earth than in its marvelous variety and abundance. Yet the incomplete statistics science gives us regarding the lower creatures are so impressive as to move the more devout to recall those Psalms which sing the praises of God as Creator. It seems as though the surface of the earth consisted largely of living creatures or their remains. Some idea of this is furnished by this extract from a condensation by The Reader's Digest of an article in Scribner's Magazine by Vernon Kellogg, Secretary of the National Research Council:

"The abundance of kinds and of individuals of our plant and animals neighbors is not commonly realized. We have discovered, classified, and named as distinct species at least three-quarters of a million of them, not taking into account those of past ages, now extinct, which we know through their fossils.

"Not only is there an abundance of kinds of animals and plants beyond familiar conception, but the numbers of individuals of most of these kinds are literally beyond the conception of any of us. The great chalk beds and cliffs of France, England, Greece, Spain, and America are composed of countless numbers of tiny shells of certain lime-secreting one-celled animals. An entomologist once started to count the plum aphids on a single small plum-tree in a badly infested orchard. After he had counted some hundreds of thousands he stopped, appalled by the number of these little creatures thus charted for the whole orchard. And there are many orchards. We know 1500 different species of ants in the world. Examine a single populous ant-hill—one of a million community homes of a single kind of ant. How many individuals are there in it?

There are over 300 different kinds of insects that find board and lodging in apple-trees. How many insect individuals are harbored by the apple-trees of the world? The gauzy-winged Mayflies which, after a night's dance of courtship, mating, and death, fall along the shores of Lake Michigan, form long wind-rows of uncountable bodies. We used to think of the soil as an inert covering of the earth. We know it now as teeming with life. The earthworms in it are sufficient to plough it, the bacteria as abundant as the very grains of it."

"To find in this persistent unfolding of life and its possibilities, its constant thrusting forward and upward, the miracle of the world—to find in all this a rational scheme of Nature, an immanent thought of God, is the task of the natural philosopher. And, finally, to feel the wonder and majesty of it and express it in music, color, and poetry, is the task of the artist."

Is DEMOCRACY, AS IT IS EXPERIENCED IN AMERICA, REACHING a stage where degeneration has set in? Having created a political system which must depend for its ultimate existence upon the active support of responsible citizens, are these same citizens as a class shifting their burden to shoulders less capable, less patriotic, less honest? Moreover, have so many of the upright and intelligent abandoned their citizenship that we are ruled in reality by minorities—and by unworthy minorities at that?

Such questions are not academic; they reflect the sober fact that, if students of our political life are correct, we are guilty of the progressive surrender of this government of, by, and for the people, through a lazy and indifferent neglect of our obligations as citizens. The Editor of the National Methodist Press wrote these words in an article on our wealth and our problems as a nation:

"The Senate committee on campaign expenses reported that in Pennsylvania primaries last spring \$2,777,942 was expended in an effort to corral the Republican nomination for the United States senatorship. In Illinois nearly \$1,000,000 was expended in contests for the same office. Thus about \$4,000,000 are involved in the election to two Senate seats. Regardless of the type of men running, and in the contests of

1926 there were certain individuals whose names dishonor an American ballot, the fact that such sums were involved takes the election outside the sphere of a democracy.

"On December 20, Senator Hefflin declared that a man prominent in a recent political and financial scandal in Washington was killed because he knew too much. He further stated that funds were being collected from bootleggers to pay political bills. Added to this are charges of selling public patronage in the South. So seriously were certain of these charges taken that a new committee has been appointed to investigate un-American and undemocratic practices ranging from conspiring with bootleggers to the buying of public office.

"No American who takes time to deliberate upon these evils now appearing in our land, evils which are so contrary to our democratic principles, can be other than seriously concerned for our national life. If none may run for office in our great commercialized States except those who have the aid of great wealth to further their entrance into office, we are on the way to a corrupt plutocracy. Two classes of citizens are responsible for the evil now threatening us. First are those who will attempt to buy their way to office and those who will sell their citizenship rights. The second is that great body of indifferent Americans who do not support this democracy by meeting their responsibilities at the polls and thus open the way for corrupt minorities to determine elections. In this country, barely one out of two citizens votes. In Great Britain, four out of five vote; in Germany, five out of six; and in Czecho-slovakia, nine out of ten. No other democracy has in this respect such a record as has ours. This whole group of evils results from a lost sense of the sacred obligations of citizenship."

BOOKS

LIFE, CHARACTER AND INFLUENCE OF DESIDERIUS ERASMUS OF
ROTTERDAM¹

"In presenting this study of the life and activities of Erasmus to the public, I realize that it differs in many respects from the conventional biography of him to which we have become accustomed."

So says Dr. Mangan in his rather elaborate Preface, a Preface which is perhaps as much an introduction as a Preface, since it not only defines the author's method and point of view, but also quite accurately summarizes the general impressions which his two volumes make upon the reader.

It seems fair to ask, wherein does this biography differ from the conventional biography? What is it that distinguishes it? It may also be fair to presume that the answer to this question will lead to an understandable basis for an evaluation of the book as a whole. The purpose of this review is, therefore, to let the paragraph from the Preface, which makes and develops this assertion, furnish us with our answer, or with a series of answers, and through these answers to seek an appraisal of the materials which make up the book.

What, then, are the outstanding characteristics of this latest life of Erasmus?

1. The reader himself is given first-hand contact with the historical sources. That is, this is not merely a narrative life of the great Humanist, fortified by more or less cryptic footnote references to the sources from which the author has drawn his conclusions, sources which in all probability are inaccessible to the average man. Rather, through constant and surprisingly extended quotations from these sources, inserted in the text itself, it puts within the reach of each reader the oppor-

¹ Life, Character and Influence of Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam. By John Joseph Mangan, A.M., M.D. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1927. Vol. I, pp. xviii+404; vol. II, pp. 427. Index, Bibliography, portraits.

tunity of forming his own independent judgment in regard to the point under consideration.

Dr. Mangan says:

"This [difference from the conventional biography] has been less a matter of intent than a direct consequence of the plan which I have followed throughout the work: of having him speak for himself always, rather than attempting to interpret his at times so kaleidoscopic mind. This has necessitated an almost constant reproduction of his letters, or lengthy quotations therefrom, entailing a toilsome burden of translation. But if by so doing I shall have rendered Erasmus more comprehensible to my readers, I shall consider it to have been labor well bestowed." (Preface, xi.)

And earlier in the Preface we find this frank avowal:

"I will state at once that I have no special thesis to prove, no speculative hypothesis to substantiate, and that any conclusions which I derive from the facts of Erasmus' life and writings are presented to the reader for his own valuation of their worth, his own estimate of their importance. . . . I cordially invite him to employ his own judgment whenever mine does not seem to him to be in accord with the facts." (Preface, vii.)

A multitude of examples could be cited in illustration of our author's adherence to this "plan." A few instances will suffice. The famous letter of Erasmus to Grunnius is given in its entirety, although it fills nineteen closely printed pages. This long quotation is justified and, let us add, made interesting by these introductory sentences:

"It may be well at this point to give a translation of this famous petition, which is constantly quoted by every biographer, but, with one exception, never given in its entirety, most probably on account of its extreme length. But as it gives many details of that part of his youth which we are now considering and which we can learn from no other source, we must of necessity suffer its prolixity on account of its importance, feeling that a perusal of this unique document will amply repay us for the time spent in the task." (I, 9.)

There is the letter to John Colet, written at the time that

Erasmus was editing Laurentius Valla's Annotations on the New Testament, which Dr. Mangan thus introduces:

"Since it contains much of interest about his own works and occupations during this interval, and because anything referring to Colet has its own attractions, it will be profitable to give it in this place" (I, 198).

There are extended and illuminating excerpts from Colet's great Convocation Sermon, avowedly quoted for this reason.

"This is perhaps the most valuable document that is now available for the use of the historian, whether he be Protestant or Catholic, who desires to draw for us of to-day a picture of the state of Catholicity in England in the days of Colet" (II, 128).

"We shall let him speak for himself where we can without being too discursive" (II, 129).

Six pages are given to Erasmus' letter to Sir Thomas More, explaining his vacillating attitude toward Luther, which was straining his relations with his fellow faculty members at Louvaine almost to the breaking point. It is prefaced in this way:

"We feel that we ought to reproduce some of Erasmus' letter here: for if we read between the lines, and make due allowance for its being written by one of the parties interested, we can elicit a fairly just attitude of both sides of the dispute, and deduce therefrom whether or not Egmondanus merits all the obloquy that Erasmus bestows on him" (II, 173).

These examples, chosen of purpose from widely different parts of the two volumes, could be multiplied indefinitely, and form one of the delightful features of Dr. Mangan's work. He himself, indeed, has very pronounced opinions in regard to various aspects of Erasmus' character and career, and he does not hesitate to express them. But he seldom leaves the reader without resources with which to check up his statements, which certainly transforms his book from "the conventional biography" type into an opportunity for independent study on the part of each reader. This characteristic is not only unusual in a biography, but is, in this reviewer's judgment, worthy of all praise.

2. To quote Dr. Mangan's own words:

"I have endeavored to impart color and interest to the narrative by the addition of historical sidelights wherever they seemed to be indicated" (Preface, xi).

"Color and interest"—history, whether in the form of biography or in any other form, without color and interest is anathema. And yet, what a large proportion of the output of scholarship lacks these very qualities. To be downright interesting seems to be dreaded as a sort of scholarly sin, to impart color to historical narrative seems to be considered as inevitably the sacrifice of scientific authenticity. But, after all, real history is only an accurate retelling of the story of life; and life is always full of color, life is always interesting.

Our author seeks to attain these vital though elusive qualities "by the addition of historical sidelights." He is remarkably successful in this. He has a faculty for clothing his characters with humanness, the minor and incidental characters as well as those that fill a large and essential place in his narrative. Such a sentence as, "We mention this incident here for the purpose of keeping our picture in due perspective," tells its own story of method.

Once more this review, for lack of space, must deny itself the pleasure of citing examples. They abound in all parts of the two volumes, and the reader is constantly discovering that he has been brought into a comprehending sympathy with the situation which is being described, almost without his knowing that the result has been accomplished. The most conspicuous instance of what seems at least partial failure in this is Dr. Mangan's development of his estimate of Luther. Our consideration of this, however, will be reserved for the next point, with the discussion of which we shall have completed our author's own explanation of the various respects in which his book "differs from the conventional biography."

3. One of the advertising sentences sent forth by the publishers is as follows:

"Dr. Mangan's analysis of the character of Erasmus de-

rives much of its penetration from his knowledge of pathology and psychology."

And the paragraph from the Preface, which we have been making the basis of this review, concludes:

"I venture to hope that the medical aspect of his life, to which I have given much study, and to which I have from time to time drawn the reader's attention in explanation of many of Erasmus' otherwise inexplicable actions, may be enlightening and profitable" (Preface, xi).

There can be no doubt as to the interest which attaches to this angle of approach, especially when the investigation is conducted by one who is as competent as Dr. Mangan. Again and again the reader becomes conscious that he is being initiated into the methods and technique of an expert diagnostician. It is probably with reference to this that the publishers say:

"This work will no doubt become a landmark in Erasmian literature. It does not close the subject, but the pronouncedly modern tone of the criticism employed ought to add much to its attractiveness for present-day readers."

Under this head it will be convenient to say a word in regard to our author's own appraisal of both Erasmus and Luther, since in the last analysis his estimates are based on his pathological diagnosis. This sentence really sums up his position:

"As our study of Erasmus has led us to decide definitely that he was a neurasthenic, so our study of Luther has convinced us that he was a psychopath, if not always, then most assuredly at intervals" (II, 87).

Erasmus a neurasthenic, Luther a psychopath—these are the formulas which are to resolve the mysteries and the contradictions of both careers. Erasmus' neurasthenia and Luther's psychopathic condition are alike traced to their earliest childhood, indeed, to pre-natal influences (vol. I, 38 and vol. II, 88), and their results are detected in the most important crises of their lives.

This neurasthenia of Erasmus seems to have manifested itself in three ways, which together formed the weakness in his character. First, his habit of weighing everything in the balance of self-interest. To quote but one brief sentence:

"Here we see one of the dominant motives of Erasmus' whole life: not, 'Is this thing right or wrong?' but rather, 'How is this thing going to affect me?' It was not conscience that made a coward of him, but self." (II, 172.)

Second, his willingness to play fast and loose with truth:

"Erasmus had a rather whimsical conception of veracity at all times, and was quite equal to telling a genteel fib if occasion demanded it" (I, 36).

Was it not this same Erasmus who coined the *bon mot* in regard to Aleander, the papal nuncio at the Diet of Worms, that he was "not bigotedly truthful"? It seems that the Prince of the Humanists was qualified to give really expert testimony in this respect. One of Erasmus' letters closes with this very enlightening interpretation of the meaning of practical piety:

"I know that it is the part of piety to conceal the truth at times, and that it is not to be put forth in every place, nor on all occasions, nor before certain people, nor in certain ways, nor without reservation."

Our author's comment is:

"Erasmus always consistently acted according to the sentiments here expressed" (II, 166).

Third, his frequent lack of any adequate moral sense.

"Erasmus had loose ways of thinking in the matter of morals."

"The man's unconscious unmorality is amazing." (II, 147.)

"This moral obliquity is astonishing, and can only be explained on the theory that he was born with a moral strabismus" (II, 148).

These quotations are typical and could be multiplied though of course they represent only one side of Dr. Mangan's evaluation of Erasmus. Perhaps a fairly accurate impression can be gathered from two quotations, the first from the early pages of volume I, the second from the close of volume II:

"The more one becomes versed in following out the mental

processes of Erasmus the more convinced he becomes that there were two Erasmuses—one the literary, and the other purely personal; and the difficulty arises in having always to distinguish between the two. As a *litterateur* he was perhaps the greatest, broadest, and most catholic writer of his age; as a man he was narrow, carping, and selfish. These qualities were ever in conflict, and at times present him to us as illogical, inconsistent, and unreasonable." (I, 37.)

"Whether or not Luther's influence still lives does not here concern us; but as for that of Erasmus we know that it has long ceased to move the minds of men actively. True, the name of Erasmus is a great one to conjure by, for the indiscriminating know not that there were two Erasmuses, the scholar and the controversialist, and that when invoking the one they are often confusing him with the other. As a scholar he was perhaps the most wonderful the world has ever known; as a reformer of Church doctrine he has left little trace." (II, 405 f.)

In regard to Luther's psychopathic condition but little need be said. It seems to this reviewer that the chapter entitled Consideration of Martin Luther differs from the rest of the book both in method and in convincing quality, and consequently in excellence. The quotations from the sources are sometimes partial, and seem to lack the atmosphere and the possible explanations which a more extended context might have given; and our author's admirable position with respect to Erasmus, "I have no special thesis to prove, no speculative hypothesis to substantiate," is evidently not maintained in the case of Luther. Needless to say this psychopathic explanation of Luther reduces the religious content of the Reformation, in so far as it crystallized in Luther's own volcanic spiritual experience, to a vanishing minimum.

Dr. Mangan recognizes the novelty of his hypothesis and says: "Hence we are bound in all justice to corroborate it with all the proof that such an assertion demands" (II, 88). In our judgment his elaborate attempt at proof fails to carry conviction.

The two volumes are gotten up in most attractive fashion, with a good Index and Bibliography, and with frequent reproductions of famous portraits. The printing and proofreading

are of the highest order, so well done, indeed, that we trust it will not seem captious to call attention to two or three slight blemishes. On page 75, volume I, the word *vous* is not accented correctly; the caption of page 195, volume II, is "Pope Louis X," where Pope Leo X is evidently intended; and on page 173, volume II, the Scriptural reference should be Luke XI, 23. One wonders, also, whether there is adequate authority for spelling Wittenberg, Wittemberg, as it is throughout the book.

But these are such trivial matters that one hesitates to mention them, especially in connection with volumes which are so full of fascinating interest and so well written. These volumes invite and will repay careful study, and will not disappoint those who are seeking a life of Erasmus that "differs from the conventional biography."

JAMES COFFIN STOUT.

THE NATURE OF RELIGION ²

THIS book should be taken and read as a tonic by those who find their theistic faith debilitated by reason of the exhausting struggle with modern science, modern philosophy, and modern life. Its pages are like a grove of balsam pines, charged with the ozone of invigorating religious convictions and rationalized established faith. It is an unusual intellectual experience in these days to have the privilege of wandering through such pages in company with a scholar of such high standing as the author, who pays such slight homage to science and modern philosophy.

Professor Paterson is not hostile to science, he is not ignorant of the findings of modern philosophy, for he is one of the old-fashioned type of well rounded scholars, such as Scotland has been in the habit of rearing. It is amusing to see him look down with such patronizing compassion upon the Lilliputian scientists and modern philosophers who stalk forth with such importance in their endeavor to win the intellectual world to

²The Nature of Religion. Gifford Lectures delivered in the University of Glasgow in the years 1924 and 1925. By W. P. Paterson, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh. New York: George H. Doran Company. 1926. Pp. xii+508.

their unmetaphysical theories. The case for historic Christianity he states constructively, clearly, convincingly, without apologizing for its tenets or his belief. And when he has finished stating his case the modern scientist and the modern philosopher can make the most of it. His own words will serve to express his fundamental attitude. The concluding sentence in the chapter on Man's Visions of God, contains this challenge:

"In any case it may well be held—as a presupposition of the discussion of the truth of theism—that the doctrine of God which is the richest result of the religious life of the race on the theoretical side, and which has been interwoven with the highest development of the intellectual and the moral life of the race, is entitled to be regarded as true unless and until an overwhelming proof can be offered from the rational side to the effect that it is either self-contradictory or that it comes into collision with some other realm of indisputable reality" (p. 381).

A book that takes such a stand, and defends it with the intellectual enthusiasm and strength that is found in these pages, could have been produced, in these days, in no land but Scotland. For that is the only country where theology retains something of its old-time prestige, and where the theologian is still a recognized and respected member of intellectual society. The Scotch theologian is still largely immune from the infection of materialism, naturalism, or Behaviorism. It is entertaining to watch Professor Paterson play with the antitheistic theories of modern psychology and modern philosophy. He takes them up and shakes them about as the terrier plays with a rat. And when he is through with them he leaves them as dead, so far as he is concerned, as the terrier leaves the rat.

This book contains the 1924 and 1925 series of Gifford Lectures. Lord Gifford laid down the requirement, that the lecturer upon this foundation should present Natural Theology, the science of infinite being, as a natural science as strictly as astronomy or chemistry. Professor Paterson frankly states that astronomy and chemistry cannot be a perfect pattern for theological study. But he presumes that the spirit of this de-

mand is, that the lecturer shall start his study of religious philosophy with a body of observable and verifiable data, and reach his conclusion through a rational manipulation of this material. The primary obligation, to treat theology as a natural science, Professor Paterson fulfills as little as any Gifford lecturer, but his interpretation of Lord Gifford's demand he fulfills to the letter. He takes his body of observable material, manipulates it rationally, and verifies it according to his own ideas.

The title, *The Nature of Religion*, suggests that this is to be a study in the field of psychology. But the author is not a psychologist; he is a great Scotch theologian. And never is there a moment in the whole series of lectures when the reader is allowed to forget that a theologian and not a psychologist is lecturing. Science and philosophy are used by him as they serve his purpose. Many of the chapters seem to indicate that the author is working in the field of psychology. For example, chapter II is entitled, *The Types of the Religious Subject*; chapter III, *Religion and the Instincts*; chapter IV, *Religion and the Subconscious*; chapter V, *The Religious Mind*; and chapter XII, *The Problem of Origins*. But there are also other subjects considered. For example, chapter VI is called *The Chief End of Religion*; chapter VII, *Religion as Duty to God*; chapter VIII, *Religion as Love of God*; chapter IX, *Religion as Light*, chapter XI, *The Way of Salvation*; chapter XIII, *Concerning the Truth of Religion*. Chapter X, *Man's Visions of God*, uses the word "visions" not in the psychological sense but in the sense of man's intellectual perceptions of God.

As these titles of the chapters indicate, the material of the lectures blends the psychological and the theological without any attempt to keep the fields separate. The truth is, psychology and philosophy are nothing more than tools which he uses when he needs them in his work as a master theologian. And when they do not serve his purpose, or are too clumsy to be skillfully used, he throws them aside, and works without them. A good illustration of his use of these tools is found in his final summary of his position. He starts with the "idea" of God as

fundamental. The problem of the nature of religion centers in the way man came into possession of this "idea" of God, and how it developed from its embryonic germ into the God of historic Christianity. This question Professor Paterson answers as follows:

"The actual position I rather take to be that the human mind, approaching the question under the impulse of the religious instinct and with the equipment of the religious tendencies, and also as subject to the play of vitalizing spiritual energies, came into possession of ideas of the Divine Being which culminated in the sublime theistic conception" (p. 381).

This gives a rather large order for modern psychology of religion to fill. The human mind, driven by the impulse of the religious instinct, and equipped with religious tendencies, and subject to the play of vitalizing spiritual energies, comes into the possession of ideas of the Divine Being. But Professor Paterson feels that he needs this sort of psychological equipment in order to make good in his theological field, and so he makes it to order, and by its help arrives at a rational explanation of the origin of the idea of a Divine Being. But he is not going to be dependent upon psychology, lest it might fail him, so he turns to the field of philosophy, and argues:

"There is a *prima facie* probability that a mental fact which has indubitable excellences of the utilitarian, aesthetic and ethical order has also a title to respect in the intellectual or theoretical aspect" (p. 380).

Carrying out this idea, he continues:

"That any idea of the Divine Being which has found lodgment in the devout mind, and nourishes the spiritual life, should be baseless, and especially that the purest and noblest form of the idea should be utterly false, is a view which seems to me to be ruled out by the unity of the system within which the human race has arisen, and by the unity of the power which is manifest and operative in the general scheme of things" (p. 380).

This point is clinched by this argument:

"For if it should turn out that an idea has emerged in the historical process which man has been constrained to value as

supremely useful, beautiful and good, while yet on testing by his powers of reason he was compelled to declare it false. This would mean that the power which has revealed itself in the world is at odds with itself, and that what it has accredited in one way it has laboured to discredit in another" (p. 381).

The strength of this argument is very marked, so that if he fails in his psychological foundations, he still holds his position in the philosophical. It is for this reason that it matters very little that Professor Paterson's psychology of religion is an amazing mass of confused contradictions. He is blissfully unaware of the magnitude of the psychological problems which he raises, and leaves unanswered. The psychological structure upon which he builds his religion consists of a religious instinct, a religious faculty, intuitive and direct contact with God through the subconscious mind, and many similar ideas. Wherever he plunges into the field of psychology he shows his unfamiliarity with the primary technical problems with which the experts are dealing. But his psychology is not an essential part of his work; in fact it could all be omitted without weakening his presentation in any way. For psychologists the course would be strengthened if these glaring blunders were removed. His theological positions he defends very ably, psychology is no psychology. And it is in this field that the real, refreshing, stimulating part of the book is found.

When a scholar of Professor Paterson's learning is unwittingly drawn into such gross psychological blunders as those which abound in his chapters it calls attention to the fact that the day when the systematic theologian can be expected to cover the whole field of theology, philosophy, and psychology is past. These fields are now too vast and technical. The time for a division of labor has arrived, and it will not be many years before every theological seminary, and religious educational institution will be forced to adopt some such plan as has already been put in operation in The Biblical Seminary. The department of theology has been divided into three parts: History, psychology, and philosophy—the history of doctrine, the psychology of religion, the philosophy of religion. Each

department is carried on by a specialist in that field, and these specialists co-ordinate their work through three separate years of progressive study.

The theologian will always have his place. But he will not be required to speak with authority in the fields where he is only a middleman. As a theologian, Professor Paterson is superior. And his book, which is in reality a study of the nature of Christian theology rather than a study of the nature of religion, is inspiring.

ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF.

PSYCHOLOGIES OF 1925³

DR. ELMER ELLSWORTH POWELL, in making possible this series of lectures in Psychological Theory, through Clark University, has placed psychology under a very deep debt of gratitude. For those most interested in this subject have felt the need for just the organization of theories that finds expression in this book. And nowhere can the purpose which led to the establishing of this course of lectures be found more clearly stated than in the words of the editor, Carl Murchison. In his Preface to the first edition he writes:

"Having during certain stages in my own student days, experienced something of the futility resulting from unadmitted fundamental differences in theoretical presuppositions, I have grown more and more convinced that experimental methods are largely instances of the more or less systematic theories of the experimenter. Practically any publication from the Cornell Psychological Laboratory carries a majority of the ear-marks of Structuralism. One would look in vain for those ear-marks in any scientific article from Watson, Hunter, or Lashley,—for the ear-marks of Behaviorism attract attention there. Any scientific publication from Berlin these days establishes once more the *Gestalt Theorie*. The pedagogical danger here is caused by the tendency of each of these theoretical groups to think of its rivals in terms of caricature, and so to describe them to the public and to young students. The

³Psychologies of 1925. Powell Lectures on Psychological Theory. Edited by Carl Murchison, Ph.D. Worcester, Mass.: Clark University. 1927. Pp. 412. Portraits.

result is that theoretical tradition becomes established in certain educational communities, and students are born structuralists or behaviorists just as one man be born a democrat or a Presbyterian."

Professor Murchison felt so keenly this "theory-frame-up" in educational communities that he convinced his father-in-law Dr. Powell, of the value of bringing together the recognized leaders of these rival psychological theories to discuss their points of view in a friendly conference. So it came about that the series of lectures contained in this volume was financed by Dr. Powell, arranged by Professor Murchison, and delivered at Clark University, beginning in January, 1925, and concluding in January, 1926.

The contents of the book and the theories presented cannot be better outlined than they are in the Table of Contents. So, we will place this at the disposal of the reader.

Part I is entitled, Schools of Behaviorism. It contains three lectures by John B. Watson and one by Walter Dill Hunter. Watson, the father of Behaviorism, devotes his lectures to the problems of What the Nursery has to say about Instincts; and the growth, loss, and changes in our emotional equipment. Professor Hunter devotes his one lecture to Anthropomony, as contrasted with the old-time psychology.

Part II, called Dynamic Psychology, consists of one lecture by Robert S. Woodworth, Professor Woodworth seems rather alone in his struggle to win recognition for his theory, but this is because much that he is striving to establish is absorbed in other forms by other theories.

Part III bears the title, *Gestalt*. There are three lectures, two by Wolfgang Kohler and one by Kurt Koffka. As is well known, Professor Koffka and Professor Kohler have been working together for many years in the field of the *gestalt* psychology. And Professor Koffka, in his book, *The Growth of the Mind*, makes very free use of the experiments and findings of Professor Kohler in his study of apes. This book by Professor Koffka has been reviewed in *THE BIBLICAL REVIEW*, so that the general point of view of these two German psycholo-

gists is well known. To this work, the American student should add a study of Professor R. M. Ogden's recent book, *Psychology and Education*. For in this is found the particular slant of the American interpretation of the *gestalt* psychology. Professor Ogden translated Professor Koffka's book into English, and he also entertained Professor Koffka during the time that he was an exchange professor at Cornell. So that he knows the *gestalt* psychology very well and is an ardent admirer of Professor Koffka.

Part IV is entitled *Purposive Groups*, and has five lectures, three by Dr. Morton Prince and two by Professor William McDougall. Dr. Prince devotes his first lecture to a study of three fundamental errors of the Behaviorists, and an attempt to reconcile the purposive and mechanistic concepts. His second lecture deals with Awareness, Consciousness and Co-consciousness, and animal intelligence from the point of view of abnormal psychology. In the third lecture he presents a *Biological Theory of Consciousness*. Professor McDougall devotes his two lectures to the consideration of the problem of whether we are "Men or Robots," robots being human machines.

Part V is called *Reaction Psychology*, and contains three lectures by Professor Knight Dunlap. Though Professor Dunlap stands alone in this field his prominence and standing as a psychologist won for him the opportunity to give three lectures. In his first lecture he deals with the theoretical aspect of psychology, in his second, with the experimental methods of psychology, and in his third with the applications of psychology to social problems.

Part VI is headed, *Psychologies Called "Structural."* Professor Madison Bentley is asked to present the claims of the Structuralists. This he does as a duty to a historical development in the field of theoretical psychology, and not as one who is championing the theory. His third lecture, *The Psychological Organism*, presents his own theory and shows his love and ardent loyalty to it. To get a clear understanding of Professor Bentley's position one should read his book, *The Field*

of Psychology. This has been reviewed in *THE BIBLICAL REVIEW*.

The advantage of having these different psychological theories presented by their authoritative leaders, in the presence of their rivals, can hardly be estimated. Each lecturer is on his metal to make out as strong a case for his theory as possible, but he is compelled to keep close to the facts, because his rivals will be in position to make short work of any serious errors. And in each case the strong constructive urge is accompanied by a very conservative criticism of one's rivals; for the rivals are present to take care of any deliberate misrepresentation of their point of view.

In spite of these controlling and conservative forces the reader is impressed with the truth of Professor Murchison's statement, that "experimental methods are largely instances of the more or less systematic method of the experimenter." From the beginning of the first lecture to the conclusion of the last the lecturers stress the importance of the experimental and scientific approach to psychological theory. Each one seems to feel that his particular brand is the only simon-pure scientific product. They all show a certain amount of contempt for philosophy and its problems, and they seem to be unconscious of the fact that their own theoretical presuppositions are controlling their experimental methods and results.

Now, I am as eager as any psychologist in the field to be scientific. And I want all the facts that experimentation can produce. And I want those facts as pure and free from theory as they can be obtained. But I have been too long in the field of psychology to imagine that there are any such things as "pure, cold, de-theorized scientific facts." In the field of science and experimental psychology, just as truly as in the field of religion, there are three factors at work: The belief, the believer, and the interpreter of the belief. The psychologist is primarily a believer. His intellectual activity is organized around a philosophy of life, a theory, and a method, three things that must be kept in mind when one studies the facts of any experimenter.

Take for example the one lecturer in this group who overworks the phrase "scientific psychology," Professor Knight Dunlap. He does his best to create the impression that the thing which distinguishes the "reactionists" from all the other schools in psychology, especially the introspectionalist, is that the reactionist school is strictly scientific. It never comes to a conclusion until it has the necessary facts to substantiate it, while other theorists are perpetually making "humorous" jumps from a few facts to theories. If one confines his knowledge of the work done by Professor Dunlap to the three lectures contained in this series the impression would be drawn that he is very faithful to his insistence upon scientific facts. For he criticizes other theories and is very cautious about stating conclusions. But when one leaves these lectures and turns to his book on Social Psychology the whole subject takes on a different aspect. For here we are brought face to face with the theories that underly Professor Dunlap's experimentation. And there is no social psychologist who states so positively his theory, and then builds upon it, as does this psychologist. One would conclude that there are no other theories of social psychology worthy of consideration than the particular ones he adopts.

For example, in his chapter on Religion he assumes that his theory of the origin of religion is the only one to be considered. And this is the theory that religion grows out of life's dissatisfactions and man's struggle to turn them into satisfactions. Now, this theory, which Professor James rejected in his day as too mechanistic and which the Columbia school, under Dewey, is championing under the idea of complacency, is one of the least widely accepted of any theory of the origin of religion. To one who has given wide and thorough study to this particular branch of the subject of psychology the final and dogmatic way in which Professor Dunlap adopts this theory is even more "humorous" than some of the blunders of the introspectionists which he records. There are also many other theories which control in his dealing with the problems of social psychology, which yield to the same criticism.

If I had my way I would insist that every experimental and "scientific" psychologist first write out his social psychological credo before he put his book on experimental and laboratory facts in the hands of his students and the public. Then the untrained reader and the unsuspecting student would be able to understand how his facts so readily support his theory. For the motivated-will-to-think, selective attention, and special interest are at work unconsciously as well as consciously from the start to the finish of every experiment and in the selection and interpretation of data. The fact that we find this personal-interest element evident in the work of experimenters is nothing against their work. For it is this personal interest that gives the emotional urge to their work, so that it is well done. It will always be present, so that the student and the reader must become accustomed to recognizing its presence.

One of the values of a book like this lies in the fact that this tendency is so apparent. Another lies in the fact that the student comes to know the field of psychology and its different schools and groups, in other words, the sects in psychology. Familiarity with the whole field of theories leaves a deposit of common accepted facts, common discarded theories, common method and attitude toward philosophy and religion as well as toward social problems. Up to the present these factors have been too exclusively in the possession of a few psychological experts. And students of psychology have been loyal adherents to the "theoretical tradition of the educational communities" in which they have studied.

Nothing can be more helpful to psychology of religion than to have such a general survey of theories and theorists to place in the hands of students of religion. For, until the sects among psychologists were revealed to the public, psychologists were wont to send their students away from the colleges and universities with the belief that all the theorists and all the philosophers and all the sects were in the field of religion. Now, they can see for themselves that there is just as much theory and just as much philosophy in every "scientific" theory of

psychology as in the theistic theory of religion, which has grown up in the field of sound psychology.

When stressing the value of laboratory work and experimental scientific psychology it must be kept in mind that the university laboratory or experimental station is not the place in which experimental work in the field of psychology of religion is to be done. The normal life with its daily human contacts and responsibilities and experiences is the religious laboratory, and the minister and the church have the best facilities for research. There is much scientific work being done today in this natural field, but it gets no publicity or consideration. And the lines of research in the fields of history and anthropology contain vast unexplored areas which never will be brought to the attention of the psychologists until a different kind of theorist enters into those fields and brings to light the facts that are as yet undiscovered. Those interested in psychology of religion must first know psychology, and a careful study of *Psychologies of 1925* is one of the best guides in a survey of the field.

ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF.

FEAR: THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF JAMES EDWARDS⁴

IN *Fear*, Dr. Oliver has written a book that has caught the fancy of several different groups of people. The psychiatrists are pleased to have him so effectively call the attention of the old-line physicians to the fact that psychological problems play a great part in the ailments of patients. The psychologists who have been featuring the fear complex for so long are pleased to have this emotional factor given such prominence. The religionists who find in Dr. Oliver's book the physician's sanction for the conquest of fear by love through religion feel that this book points the way to a new lease of life for religion in this field. And the Christian Scientists, and all spiritual healing cults, are pleased because it seems to con-

⁴ *Fear: The Autobiography of James Edwards*. By John Rathbone Oliver, A.B., M.D. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1927. Pp. ix+366.

firm their special claims. The general public is pleased by the universal inclusiveness of his whole point of view. As a result the reviews which have appeared are most enthusiastic. Especially those that hail from the superbelief, the psychiatric, and religious camps.

The gist of the contents of the book is well given in these words of the publishers:

"Fear is a hangover from the primitive and there is little useful work left for it to do. Like other idlers it spends its time getting into mischief and getting those who harbor it into hot water.

"You will be deeply interested in the testimony of John Rathbone Oliver concerning the havoc it is raising in thousands of lives. His Johns Hopkins and other associations have given him opportunities for observing its workings that have rarely been equalled. He has discovered that the only class of people *not* requiring help, *not* obsessed or poisoned by fear of one sort or another at some time or other are the truly religious.

"His book is an absorbing story of a business man who fought his way through fear to religion. As to the intense interest of the narrative and its faithfulness to facts, the comments in the circular abundantly testify."

The story purports to be the autobiography of James Edwards. Edwards is a successful business man who in middle life becomes a victim to the fear complex of sickness and death, and after a long struggle at last gains a victory over his fear and regains his health. The titles of a few chapters will give a good idea of the way the plot is worked out. The first is, *The Coming of Fear*; the second, *Poisoned by Fear*; the third, *On the Right Road at Last*; the fourth, *Psychiatric Report and Personality Analysis*; the ninth, *The Results of Fear*; the thirteenth, *The Casting Out of Fear*; the fourteenth, *Perfect Love*.

As a work of fiction Dr. Oliver has given us an interesting and helpful book; but if one should take it as a true autobiography of a real man's experience much harm might result, for there are many dangerous spots in it. In the first place, the fear complex is exaggerated out of all proportion to its

actual influence. Psychologically there are a number of other factors that play upon the spirit of James Edwards besides fear, and fear never has such an undisputed right of way as is given to it in this tale. Of course we are living in a fear-mad era. Lewis Brown's *This Believing World*, which was reviewed in *THE BIBLICAL REVIEW*, is a splendid illustration of the way this fear complex is being worked to explain the origin and growth of religion. And now the psychiatrists are featuring it as the cause of sickness and nervous breakdown. This is giving rise to a large output of books and articles and preachments upon this subject. But the fear complex is seriously overworked. However, Dr. Oliver touched upon a popular interest when he featured this.

Another factor which makes the book popular is the inclusiveness of its spirit. Every method of treatment for the ills that flesh is heir to is given recognition—Christian Science, orthodox medical science, psychiatry, spiritual healing, and religion. The cure is much worse than the disease. In the religious realm the patient has to pass through the same universality and inclusiveness of treatment as he does in the medical realm. The Christian Scientist, the Jewish rabbi, the Catholic priest, the Protestant minister, all have their chance at the patient, and he receives from each one something that the others did not possess. So that his cure would not have been religiously complete had he not spent time with each one of these religious teachers. This sort of thing reads well and sounds tolerant and broad-minded. But the last state of any man would be much worse than his first if he had to submit to this universality and inclusiveness of medical and religious treatment.

The reviewer could not but feel that there was an ulterior motive back of all this fiction, and that the Doctor had something else in mind than his patient when prescribing such a remedy. In fact there were many questionings and suspicions in the mind of the reviewer before he finished the book. This does not mean that he underestimates the dangers arising from the fear complex, or the importance of having the physician

and minister working together in pathological cases. Anyone who has read his books on Christian Science and on Acute and Chronic Unbelief will never make such a mistake, for he has been working for years with physicians along this line, and advocates in all of his classes such co-operation. But we suspect that any one who utilizes religion as Dr. Oliver does in his book is not overworking the religious end of the combination in his own personal experience, for this has not the ring of deep religious conviction. Of course this may be a criticism wide of the mark, for the reviewer is not personally acquainted with Dr. Oliver, but he has worked in the religious field many years, and, as a practical proposition, this suggested treatment is incapable of being put into practice with a normal middle-aged business man.

If the reader will take the book as a work of fiction, and James Edwards as the creation of Dr. Oliver's imagination, we believe that the reading of this book will be very helpful. But if one allows the fact that Dr. Oliver is a physician to lead him to take this story as a historical account of the actual experience of middle-age fear complex collapse and its scientific treatment and cure, much harm might result. We believe that Dr. Oliver himself wishes the fiction element to control his story.

The overenthusiastic commendations of this book by prominent religious leaders, church periodicals, and preachers because it contains the statement that, "The only class of people *not* requiring help, *not* obsessed or poisoned by fear of one sort or another at some time or other are the truly religious," and because it works out so well the point that fear is conquered by love, and that love is most effectively made universal through religion, lead the reviewer to add one word of warning in closing. Psychologically this over-simplification and exaggeration of the spiritual problem of the middle-aged business man, or the middle-aged woman is fraught with many unsuspected perils. The lay mind needs to go very slowly at this point. The guidance of the expert psychologist who is truly at home in the field of psychology of religion and deeply

interested in religion should be given a chance to appraise these psychological solutions before they are seized upon and broadcasted to the unsuspecting public with the stamp of approval of physicians and the clergy.

ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF.

JOHN WYCLIF⁵

WHEN this reviewer was writing the Wyclif chapters for the Hurst History of the Christian Church, vol II (published 1900), research had cleared itself to the following results:

1. Wyclif's opposition to the Pope was not due to the latter's decision for monks in the matter of expulsion of secular priests from Canterbury Hall (Dr. Workman agrees). 2. Our Wyclif was the warden of that Hall (Dr. Workman agrees). 3. The question of politics first brought him out against the Pope (Dr. Workman agrees). 4. The papal schism (1378) occasioned a strong attitude against the papacy even as such (Dr. Workman agrees). 5. As to doctrine, every Christian is a priest, has a right to read the Bible in the vernacular and get his ideas from it, for it is the only rule of faith and practice; preaching is all important, a layman can preach if necessary, ordination not being absolutely necessary; the nonprelatic theory of the ministry is held; the Pope is not infallible; the sacraments are not necessarily vitiated by evil living of ministers, though that evil living is of course a fearful sin; Christ is spiritually and really present in elements of the Supper—a kind of consubstantiation, though transubstantiation is rejected; the church must not dominate the state, but, if anything, *vice versa*; in essence right of rulers rests on their fidelity and goodness, though violation of this does not excuse insubordination or anarchy of subjects; there is no merit or treasury of merits, no works of supererogation, no indulgences (on these points Dr. Workman agrees).

⁵ John Wyclif: A Study of the English Mediaeval Church. By Herbert B. Workman, D.Lit., D.D., Principal of Westminster College. New York: Oxford University Press (American Branch). 1926. Vol I, pp. xl+342; vol. II, pp. xii+435. Index. Illustrations.

The point was also made that Wyclif's doctrine of faith was not Paul's trust in Christ, but rather belief in true doctrines, though we don't remember that this is touched on by Dr. Workman. The author is convinced, however, that Wyclif was a translator of the Bible only in the sense of inspiring and superintending it, that his actual translations, as in the Gospels, were only in his sermons, and that Hereford and Purvey were the real translators of Wyclif's Bible, assisted by others.

It is also pleasant to notice that the older Wyclif authorities are still of value, notably Vaughan (in his second work, *John de Wycliffe: a Monograph*, 1853), Lechler (1884), and Sergeant (in the *Hero of Nations* series, 1893). No mention is made of the long and splendid article by Loserth in *Hauck's Realencyclopaedie*, volume 21 (1908), and the new edition of his *Wiclif und Hus* came out too late to be utilized.

The author is well known for his works in medieval church history, and he came to his task after long preparation and with unsurpassed fitness and ability. He has spent twelve years in sinking himself in Wyclif's Latin and English works, has brought up rich spoils, and has put a noble capstone on the arch of Wyclif literature. Especially to be commended are the notes, references, and appendices, with their amazing minuteness of learning.

The book throws a flood of light also on many departments of church history suggested by Wyclif's life, such as the history of Oxford as town and as university, scholasticism and its representatives, English politics and political theories, church and state, the papacy, the Avignon popes, the Great Schism, monasticism, the Franciscans, various abuses, medieval translations of the Bible and knowledge of it, preaching, condition of peasants, the revolt of 1381, the later history of the Lollards (whom he thinks persisted in certain parts of England until the Reformation, confirming this writer in the *Hurst History*, vol. II, pp. 43 f., 50 f.), and other interesting details.

The work thus well justifies its subtitle as *A Study of the English Mediaeval Church*, and is one of the most important of the kind ever written. It preserves a strict impartiality.

and one hardly detects a place where a Roman Catholic could complain of straining of evidence or too favorable judgment of its hero. Wyclif's limitations and faults come into full light.

But if a Catholic can have no objection, a Lutheran may have. There is an interesting comparison of Wyclif's and Luther's attitudes toward disabilities of serfs, laborers, etc., perhaps more to the disadvantage of the German than a thorough study would justify (compare the paper on Luther and Economic Questions, in Papers of the American Society of Church History, series II, vol. II, p. 133 ff.), and especially their attitudes toward the Peasants' Rebellion of 1381 and 1525 respectively. Luther did not urge the princes to "brain" the peasants, and the *steche, schlage, würge* of his second pamphlet applied to regular war and not to assassination or massacre, of which the peasants themselves had been guilty, and in a crisis when absolute anarchy seemed pending. And the truth is just the contrary to the author's remark: "Nor did Luther issue a single protest against the savage vindictiveness with which the revolt was suppressed" (Workman: vol. II, p. 245). The learned author is not to be blamed for knowing more about Wyclif than Luther, and it is no reflection that he has not read Luther's third pamphlet nor the extracts from it in Kawerau's *Köstlin*. But he had at his elbow in his own church's London Quarterly Review, July, 1910, the means of verifying a statement which will put Luther in a false light to the nonexpert for the many generations in which this monument more enduring than brass will speak of Wyclif.

One or two queries or notes for a new edition. There is no clue to place, etc., of Loserth's *Mittheilungen*, volume I, p. 10, note 3. For C. G. Harnack read A. V. Harnack, I, p. 103, note 1. On *Defensor Pacis*, Emerton's monograph is not referred to, Harvard Theological Studies, VIII (1920), I, p. 132, note 2. "Wyclif did not see that his conception of anti-christ, pushed to its logical issue ends in dualism," etc., II, p. 11. This does not follow unless he held that antichrist is as eternal as God. "From Wyclif's premises there also follows

his deliverance from a doctrine of sin dependent on the Fall" (II, p. 12). But to him the idea of sin could be eternal in the mind of God, and yet historically dependent on the Fall. Add to note 2, II, page 99, Muzzey's *Spiritual Franciscans* (1907). "Won for Wyclif at an early date the proud title of 'doctor evangelicus'" (II, p. 150). At what date? Add to note 2, II, page 170, H. Middendorf: *Studien über R. Rolle von Ham-pole, Madgeburg* (1888, 62 pp.). For Horstmann read Horstman.

JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER.

THE PARABLES: THEIR BACKGROUND AND LOCAL SETTING⁶¹

THIS book claims distinction in that it is an interpretation of the parables of the Man of Galilee by one who is also of Galilee. Having been reared within sight of Nazareth and the surrounding country—the very places in which a great many of the parables were spoken—the author considers himself well qualified to supply the local coloring, the details of the background, so to speak, of these wondrous utterances. Up to the time he was sent to school in Jerusalem he had not even seen a vehicle of any description; his early training and experiences were thus peculiarly Palestinian. "The Old Testament narratives were as intelligible to me as the freshly written accounts of yesterday's events."

In the light of Calvary, he who came from "one of the most pious homes of a very orthodox Jewish city," now looks upon Nazareth and the Nazarene from the standpoint of one who has been redeemed. He makes it his aim to set forth in as simple a manner as possible his understanding of the subject-matter and meaning of the parables, without entering too extensively into the already well worked field of textual and critical study.

The reviewer finds, however, that the author does not hesitate to express his views on critical and textual problems when

⁶¹The Parables: Their Background and Local Setting. By the Rev. N. Levison. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1926. Pp. xxvi+253. Diagram.

ever occasion arises. Take as a typical example of his method, in the treatment of Luke 11:5-9, commonly known as the parable of The Friend at Midnight, or The Importunate Neighbor. These titles are descriptive, but inexact and misleading. The author's title is, God's Readiness to Answer Prayer, which suggests the lesson Jesus doubtless had in mind in the light of the hospitality in which Eastern people love to excel. This is where "local color" aids in appreciation of this oft misconstrued parable.

"In the case of the small villages and nomadic peoples, the flour is kneaded and baked on the same day; very often only enough for one meal is baked, but as a rule the baking is for the requirements of the whole day. . . . It is often impossible to judge with exactness the quantity required, and so it comes about that a good deal of borrowing among neighbors takes place. . . . The friend of our story arrived late on the night prior to baking-day, and found the family breadless. The host, after making his friend at home by offering him water to wash himself, went off to borrow some bread. . . . Except among the rich, the house consists of one large room which serves the whole family. The bedding is kept in a recess in the wall, and at night-time is taken out and spread on reed mats on the floor. . . . With an average family the father's getting up would certainly disturb the household, especially the children sleeping next to him. This would offer a good excuse for the lender, should he wish an excuse. *The main fact is that he does get up and lend the friend the bread asked for.* We must notice that the whole parable is in the interrogative—'Who among you having a friend?' . . . What Jesus draws on is that a friend will not refuse us what we stand in need of. How much less will God do so? Jesus would teach us that what appeals to our Father is not our importunity, but the need out of which our importunity arises. Our Heavenly Father is ready to answer our prayers, not merely because we are children, but because we are needy children. . . . When life's problems are pressing us sore, we may turn to God in confidence that He will not refuse us what we stand in sore need of." (Italics mine.)

Three considerations are set down as necessary guides to a correct interpretation of the parables: 1. What is the

background? 2. How much of the local color of the parable is to be taken as mere elaboration, and how much is essential to the essence of the lesson? 3. What is the pith of the parable, which, as a rule, is stated at the close of the illustrative material and is generally summed up in a single sentence? It is by applying these principles, as illustrated above, that each parable is considered and its lesson revealed.

While many of the facts and interpretations here given may be found in other books on this subject, a distinct contribution to New Testament interpretation has been made in the illuminating sidelights of environing Hebrew life just as it was when Jesus spoke the parables.

One feature of the book that is worthy of special commendation is its homiletic suggestiveness. The preacher will find many potent germs for sermons in these pages. A number of titles developed in the treatment of the various parables will illustrate the point: True Freedom (Matt. 17:24-27); Acceptance of Opportunity as the Test of Character (Luke 10:25-37); The Culture of the Soul (Luke 12:13-48); Divine Patience (Luke 13:3-10); The Consequence of Refused Invitations (Luke 14:16-24); The Indivisibility of Faithfulness (Luke 16:1-13); The Sources of Authority (Matt. 21:23-32).

Some of the readers of this book may feel that the author has too loose an idea of what a parable is. For instance Matthew 17:24-27 is considered as a parable, when it is really the report of a miracle. Yet it is true that "each parable is a miracle of wisdom, and each miracle is a parable" in action.

An Appendix in the form of a chart giving in parallel columns the chronological arrangement of the parables, by such authorities as Andrews, Trench, Edersheim, Swete, and Bruce, reveals that Mr. Levison counts 28 parables in the Gospels, which is 2 more than Andrews, 6 more than Trench and 10 more than Swete. The difference of course depends upon the viewpoint adopted in each case.

HOWARD TILLMAN KUIST.